For some reason he gave up his position at Newark. After he had spent all his savings he began to look for a pulpit. He was offered the position at Newport News, Va. at $2000, which he accepted very reluctantly. That was about two years ago. Now he is getting $3500 and he is very happy.

When I arrived at Tannersville I found a few of my rabbinical colleagues; among them were Chas. Kauvar of Denver and Louis Epstein of Brookline. The former is a pious soul, but rather simple minded; the latter is the son of the typical scheming old time traditional rabbi. Epstein has a fair grounding in the Talmud and therefore a vested interest in obstructionism. He always manages to rub me the wrong way. This time too before a half an hour was over we fell into a dispute about the meaning of the term (p.208) .

The first session of the Convention took place Tuesday afternoon with about 40 men present. The fifteen minute presidential message of Elias Margolis contained very little of any significance. A neat little talk on Herzl was delivered by Feinberg of Cincinnatti. Finkelstein's paper on Hoschander was very unexciting. In the evening Robert Gordis read a paper on the personality of Koheleth. There can be no question that Gordis is a man of exceptional ability. He has a large fund of information and an extraordinary gift for language. His eloquence is torrential.

Gordis was followed by Henry Rosenthal who read a review of Steinberg's, Eugene Kohn's and my book. It was, I thought, a very fair and lucid analysis of each of the books. Mine came in for a great deal of praise; naturally, I felt very happy when I heard what he had to say of it.

The discussions of the day following were rather tame. I was interested to hear from Finkelstein who read Greenstone's report of the Committee on Law, that Morris Levine proposed what for him is a very radical step, in the matter of the Jewish divorce. He suggested that the principle of (p.208) be applied outright in cases where the husband refused to give a Jewish divorce. That would make Epstein's laborious and complicated Takanah

superfluous, and would pave the way for genuine legalistic reform of Jewish law. The absurd lengths to which the right wing members of the committee would go in their attempt to keep within the letter of the traditional law is illustrated by the accompanying draft of a statement which would have to be signed by witnesses at the time a marriage ceremony is performed in order to forstall complications arising out of the defunct practice of the leviate marriage.

Wednesday evening after the "speechless" banquet, two papers were read on the question of what attitude to take toward anti-Semitism. One paper was by Waldman, Executive Secretary of the American Jewish Committee and the other was by Grayzel of Gratz College, Phila. Both papers were read by substitutes. Margolis was about to declare the session adjourned, when I asked for the floor. I was in doubt whether or not to speak, but once having made a gesture indicating that I wanted to say something I couldn't back out. (As a matter of fact I find it necessary often to override my own hesitancy in asking for the floor when I know that I ought to make some comment but haven't got it clearly formulated in my own mind. I feel that if I were to allow myself to give in to the fearthat I might not express myself as well asI should like to I would make a habit of my timidity. This I can least afford to do.) The applause which greeted me when I rose to speak heartened me and stimulated me, no doubt, to do better than I would have done ordinarily. In my remarks I criticized the attitude of the American Jewish Committee for finding it necessary to prove that the Nazi charge of Communism against the Jews of Germany is unfounded. I also pointed out the unwarranted oversight on the part of Grayzel in failing to mention the fact that anti-Semitism was outlawed in Russia. What I said had the effect of emancipating some of the more liberal minded among the men from the fear of giving utterance to their views, and they showed it by their applause.

I was annoyed, to say the least, by Steinberg's talk which followed mine. He contended that there was no real difference between the attitude of Russia and that of the democratic movement as far as anti-Semitism was con-

cerned, and that we must resign ourselves to the fact that anti-Semitism was inherent in the very nature of human society.

Gordis and Boxer agreed with my presentation of the case.

In informal discussion after the session I was questioned by a number of men as to Russia's suppression of the Jewish religion, Hebrew, Zionism, etc. My reply was that it was not communism but the Jewish communists who are chiefly to blame for that.

I left Tannersville Thursday before the convention was over. Schwefel who went home by car took Finkelstein and me with him. Finkelstein and I have certainly learned to get along together much better than we ever did in the past. I was interested to hear from him about the late Prof. Friedlaender who was driven by the ambition of his wife to undertake communal work through which he met his death. (Important to note that F. was married ~~Jellen~~ ~~Friedlander~~ to Jellen F. Sister, Carmel Bentwich.)

* * *

Tuesday, July 10, 1934

Jacob Golub came to see me yesterday with reference to the next step to be taken by the group constituting the Council for the Advancement of American Jewish Life. We arrived at the conclusion that for the present the possibility of convening them was out of the question, but that we ought to go ahead with the endeavor to issue the symposium which we originally planned.

Incidentally Golub commented on my book of which he had readonly about 150 pages. I must now begin to take note of the criticisms that come from men whose opinions deserve to be reckoned with. The impression he gathered from what he had read so far is that I was bent upon discovering some purpose for Jewish life. I therefore imply, he claims, that Jewish life can be shared only by those who subscribe to the particular purpose I advocate. It appears from this criticism that I should have brought out more clearly the fact that what I contend for is a planned Jewish life rather than one dedicated to some universal purpose.

In this connection I want to record the two other criticisms which I shall have to take into account. One is by Rabbi Alper who reviewed the book in the Hebrew Union College Monthly. There he finds fault with me for not considering the communist alternative to the various solutions of the Jewish problem, which I discuss. When he showed me the draft of his review I told him his point was well taken. The other criticism is Morris Levine's. He said that whereas in the first part of the book I imply that there is nothing unique to the Jewish people, that implication is contradicted in the later chapters. Whatever topic I discuss leads me to making the point that the Jewish people contrived to evolve an element or aspect that was unique. When Levine mentioned this fact I told him that I had noticed it myself, but it would have necessitated making too many changes in the text. It is a poor excuse, of course, but the truth is that when I discovered this inconsistency I had already added so much to the cost of author's corrections that I did not feel like piling up some more.

A certain Rabbi Epstein of Atlanta, Ga. has been trying for the last year and a half to get the Seminary to help him acquire a modern scientific approach to Jewish subject matter. Finally his application for the DHL was reported at the last meeting of the faculty and it was decided that he interview some of us. In consonance with this decision he came to see me yesterday. I learned from him that he came to this country at the age of seven and was now thirty-one. He is the son of an old time Rav in Chicago and nephew of a well known Rabbi Epstein who came to this country a few years ago in the interests of the Yeshibah of Slobodba and Hebron. Thanks to that background the ideal of becoming a Talmudic scholar governed the life of the young man. He studied in the Yeshibot of Chicago, New York, Slobodka and Hebron and obtained Semika. That did not prevent him later from going to college and getting his BA and MA. He is perfectly secure in his position as rabbi of an Orthodox congregation and he has no competition from any graduate

of the Seminary. Nevertheless he is restive because he feels a sense of lack in having failed to obtain a modern organized training in Jewish lore.

The kind of spiritual maladjustment is, of course, very rare in Jewish life, but it is so definitely the product of the planlessness which prevails in the entire process of Jewish education that it may well be considered symptomatic of our spiritual chaos. Here is a man who has spent years and years of study of Jewish lore and yet feels himself completely helpless. Talmudism, in addition to arresting the spiritual growth of the Jews, is responsible for having so burdened their memory that it gave no chance to organize their ideas. Maimonides must have felt the same way about the Talmud. He tried to displace it with his Yad ha-hazakah, but unfortunately he did not succeed.

Taking this attitude toward the Talmud I cannot say I am wildly enthusiastic over Dr. Levine's discovering a few fragments of Geonic works that had been lost and in general over his efforts to collect the Geonic writings. It is true that from an archaeological standpoint these discoveries are all to the good, but the trouble is that anyone who wants to have scholastic standing must be up on all these archaeological finds. I make mention of Levine because he spoke at the convention of the Rabbinical Assembly last week and gave an interesting account of his research in Geonica.

Jewish learning will be plagued by the problem of disorganization and disproportionate effort as long as we fail to distinguish that part of Jewish content which is necessary for living intelligently in the present and that part which has only archaeological significance. I realize that it is not always possible to draw the line accurately but by and large that should not be difficult. Note, for example, that except for such treatises as had a bearing on current practice, the orders of Kodoshim and Taharot were not studied in the Babylonian academies. What was true of Kodoshim and Taharot then is true of the greater part of the Talmud now. It should be possible to select from the rabbinic writings those portions which can have relevance for

our day and have them arranged in systematic form so that they can easily be mastered. He who would undertake such a task would render the Jewish cause an inestimable service.

I have turned down two invitations to participate in memorial exercises for Bialik who died last week; one was from Ribalow on behalf of the Histadrut Ivrit and the other was from Morris Rothenberg on behalf of the ZOA. I offered ill health as an excuse. In justification of what I did I wish to say that with my limited mental and physical capacities I must conserve them for that which I feel best qualified to do. There will be plenty of people to eulogize Bialik and they will do so much more eloquently than I can. Bialik'smemory surely does not need my indoresement. Why then should I interrupt my work in which I am just now engaged for what is so dispensable as a ~~xxxxxxx~~ speech by me on Bialik?

* * *

Tuesday, July 17, 1934

I have written out various prayers and readings for Rosh Hashanah and Yom Kippur and I am now back again at the problem of what to work on next for the course at Seminary the coming year. I am again thinking of the theme of salvation as the most promising. The following ideas about it ran through my mind this morning as I was making my toilet:

It is necessary to become salvation-conscious or salvation-minded in order to counteract two tendencies: 1) toward pessimism and disillusion which comes from the disease of self-consciousness, and 2) toward all forms of narrow specializations which fill the whole of life's horizon, whether it be in the fields of science, art, adventure or in that of social reform. Under this heading is to be included the Marxian purpose of developing class consciousness.

While being salvation-minded is no new thing in the world, the nature and content of salvation are radically different from those upon which human

beings centered their hopes in the past. The purpose is not to find assurance of immortality - as the ancients understood it - and compensation for the frustration in this life which was assumed to be irredeemable, but to find a method of finding this life and this world as satisfying and fulfilling as possible.

Salvation-mindedness would thus be a means to seeing and making life whole, on the assumption that only reintegration of human life which is fragmentized by the sciences and abstract philosophies, by the cultivation of special interests and by the attempts to look to some form of social improvement as holding out the panacea for all human ills.

It seems that the first fact to be reckoned with in aiming at salvation mindedness is that all existence is characterized by the attribute of polarity.

* * *

Wednesday, July 18, 1934

I went into the city today and had to spend a good deal of time on the trains. Instead of using that time to read, I used it to get a better grip on the problem of salvation. I think I succeeded in arriving at a far better understanding of the subject than I had yesterday. The ideas I set down yesterday (see above) now seem to me to be all awry. I found that the main cause of the confusion was the failure to formulate a satisfactory definition of the salvation which the modern man quests after. This I believe I have now.

Salvation is that organization and adjustment of life which enables us to do the best we can and to bear the worst that may befall us.

The "best we can" means giving expression in integrated fashion to all phases and capacities of our personality in terms of the true, the good and the beautiful.

The worst that befalls us includes both suffering and sin in the various degress to which they afflict us. What are the requisites to our

being able to do the best we can? Work, health, knowledge, leisure and love.

So interrelated is human life that no one can attain salvation so long as there are others who are precluded from attaining it. In reality, however, very few are so situated as to be able to do the best they can. If we want to be accurate, we should say that no one can do his best, not even the most economically secure, since it is impossible at the present time to be economically secure without contributing to somebody else's insecurity. Should the one thus situated obey the dictates of his conscience and surrender his wealth, he would even be less able to give expression to his abilities and higher tendencies, since his lack of means would enslave him to the will of those who possess them. Thus from whatever angle we look at it, the first object to be reckoned with in the problem of salvation is an economic system that would eliminate the evil of unemployment and insecurity.

It is not necessary to go far in search of the qualities that a person cannot develop under the present system. It is enough to point out the difficulty of being honest.

Under the heading of love I include all those relationships -- family, community, nation, etc. -- which integrate the life of the individual with the life of others in an organic sense and not merely mechanical. These are the relationships which give the human being the feeling of adequacy, dignity and self-respect.

The second half of the problem of salvation would deal with the task of finding what we must think, feel and do to retain our equilibrium in sickness, bereavement, humiliation, poverty and helplessness in the faceof the wrong and cruelties of life by which we benefit; in other words sin in its various forms.

In this analysis we must assume that reality is of such a nature as to help man achieve salvation, if he only knows how. This fact about reality constitutes its element of holiness. The hypostasis of that element is expressed in the concept of God.

* * *

Thursday, July 19, 1934

THE Ancients with their conception of olam ha-ba had no difficulty in meeting the requirements of salvation as defined above, since the promise of reward was effective in eliciting what they regarded as their best, and the very continuance in the hereafter afforded consolation for all they endured in this world. For the modern man, however, salvation is an extremely complex problem. He has no authoritative code to tell him what constitutes his best and after having learned what his best would be, he has to discover the conditions and means necessary to elicit it. Before long he becomes so absorbed in some specific condition or means that he forgets the end altogether.

Edman in his "The Contemporary and His Soul" merely skims over the problem of salvation. He fails to distinguish the two purposes comprised in salvation, and for the most part discusses those types which are intended as anodynes to alleviate the anxieties and hardships of life.

Mother, God bless her, in spite of her age (somewhere in the seventies -- 77 or 78) and illness is critical of anything I do that ~~xxxxx~~ isn't quite "kosher." When I visited her yesterday she told me, after asking me not to be angry, that she didn't like my putting the questions to groom and bride under the Huppah when I officiated at Judith's and Ira's wedding. She thought it was too "goyish."

To come back to present preoccupation -- I see that for the purpose of a more thorough discussion of the idea of salvation I have to depart from the use of that term in my book "Judaism as a Civilization." There I fall into the error of Edman and others in using it to designate the state of existence which is consequence of a certain manner of living, whereas it is rather the organization of life, which is conducive to that manner of living, that constitutes salvation. This distinction paves the way for a fruitful discussion of the problem.

The achievement of salvation presupposes, or rather expresses itself through the moral and rational functioning of the various relationships into which one's life is interwoven. Since work, health, knowledge, love and leisure are necessary to salvation, the moral and rational character of the functioning of the various relationships is determined by the degree to which they make those goods possible.

The relationships which have to function morally and rationally are the family, husband, wife, parent child; the community, the pupil-teacher, economic relationships, citizen-state, nation-mankind, individual-cosmos.

What is the place of faith in this scheme? Is it identical with salvation (as above defined) ir is it a means to it? It is evident that while it enters into every relationship, it does so most consciously in the individual-cosmos relationship. Religion might therefore well be defined as the moral and rational functioning of the individual-cosmos relationship. As a result of such functioning - or perhaps in the very process of such functioning - the individual acquires faith. The need for faith (which seems to point to its being a phase of salvation itself) is when we suffer frustration, pain, etc.

Salvation as a goal supplies civilization with a much needed criterion.

* * *

Friday, July 20, 1934

MOTL Diary

From the apparently little effect which all these exalted ideas about salvation seem to have upon me personally -- considering how far I am from doing the best, etc. -- I began to suspect the value of those ideas. But then I recalled two facts which reconciled me to the paradox of urging something upon others which has but little effect on myself. First, the fact clearly pointed out by Aristotle that a desirable state of character cannot be attained through knowledge merely/ It calls for long and arduous habituation, and not having being habituated to live my ideas I am condemned to keep on talking about them. Secondly, physicians who are cardiacs and consumptives are said to have an advantage over those who are well in having first hand knowledge of the diseases they try to cure.

* * *

Wednesday, July 25, 1934

I received this morning from Rabbi M. Alper copies of "New Masses" July 17 and 24 containing a refutation of Dwey, Russel and Cohen's arguments against Communism, which appeared in . The refutation swept me off my feet. I realized that I had allowed myself to be fooled by their sophistries, although I must admit that even at the time I read them I had a lurking suspicion of their soundness.

It seems that the only way a man in my position can manage to exist is deliberately to split his personality and lead a sort of Jekyll and Hyde existence. Otherwise I am likely to go insane or be a complete failure. All this fine talk about integrating one's personality is mere piffle. That doesn't mean to say I shall not wax enthusiastic about it, but I shall do it with that part of my personality which is bourgeois and parasitic. There will undoubtedly continue to operate a certain osmosis between the two personalities in me, but I must recognize the class struggle as existing between them no less than between the capitalists and the proletariats. I believe I shall be better off if I henceforth identify them as two separate entities even to the extent of naming them as though they were two distinct persons. I shall call one Mordecai (the old Adam) and the other Menaham (the regenerate me). Mordecai is a liberal bourgeois. Menahem is an out and out Communist.

Who am I in this business? I wonder how Spinoza would have acted in ~~xxxxxxxxxxxx~~ my position or would he have been careful not to maneouvre himself into it?

O God! what a mess human beings have made of their lives!

By this time I have a somewhat clearer idea of how to tackle the problem of human life as a whole. In fact I can think of no better name for what I am attempting than "A New Approach to the Problem of Life."

After a preliminary discussion of 1) the traditional religious approach and 2) the scientifically ethical approach and pointing out wherein they have

failed, I shall propose the instrumental approach which reckons with life as with any skill or art. The first thing to do is to have some idea of the objective to be attained. That objective in the case of life, it may be assumed is the capacity to do our best. By that is meant leading as rational, moral and creative a life as it is possible for us to do. "Leading a life" at once implies functioning in specific relationships. As long as one breathes, one lives, but "to lead a life" involves acting with relation to one another or alter.

We lead a rational, moral and creative life when we function in our various relationships in such a way as to elicit from our neighbor the best in him,i.e. the most rational, moral or creative life of which they are capable.

Life like fire maintains itself only by communicating itself. (Guyan)

Moralists as a rule have considered this functioning mainly in terms of direct contact with or influence upon other persons. While this phase of functioning is no doubt important, it is far more important to reckon with the phase which has to do with the conditions, material, social and spiritual, upon which human life so much depends. In a discussion of the domestic relationships it is more important to analyze the material and social conditions conducive to their normal functioning than to urge the attitudes of love, self-sacrifice, etc.

Dealing with the problem of human life as a whole in terms of conditions in their relation to the functioning of the various relationships which constitute the web of human life is the chief novum in this approach.

To lead a rational, moral and creative life means to achieve the maximum of truth, cooperation, creativity, integration and faith.

The conditions which are most conducive to such a life are health, work, play, love.

The relationships through which we want to function rationally, morally, and creatively so as to elicit life functioning from others by our direct influence and more especially as a consequence of the conditions we

help to bring about are: 1) the body, 2) the mind, 3) the family, 4) the economic, 5) the political, 6) the cultural.

The craving for humor is a sure index of the sense of the frustration which marks our lives. The ancients who led serene lives needed no humor to lubricate their existence. Witness Homer. And in modern times one meets very little humor in communist literature. The notion that humor is necessary to get one's idea across is also an illusion. Take the case of Hitler, the most humorless man alive.

* * *

Friday, August 3, 1934

I have moved a long way from the concept of salvation. Even the notion of life as an art no longer appeals to me, because of the ambiguous meaning of the term "art." At the present stage the problem of human conduct presents itself to me as a problem in management. Taking them as my theme "How to Manage Our Lives" I find that the discussion would have to be divided into three parts: I:"How to Spiritualize Our Conduct," II: How to Socialize It" and III: How to Rationalize it."

I: Those who depart from the traditional method of resorting to authority as a guide to the management of life and go to human nature for guidance make the mistake of believing that they must discover within the tendencies and habits of the human being the basic principles of such management. It is like imagining that electrical engineering should begin with the study of an eledtrical dynamo instead of with the general principles of physics. The only logical procedure in the scientific management of life is to deal first with the fact of life and reality as a whole. Some kind of world review is a prerequisite to any organized conduct of life. (Cf. Wm. James' statement in his "Pragmatism" to the effect that before accepting a bodger one ought to know his philosophy of life. Cf. Sedgwick's conclusion in his "Methods of Ethics.) But then there are thinkers who maintain that irrespective of the

the nature of reality it should be possible to organize our lives morally and rationally. (Cf. Guyan, Russell, Lippmann) They don't realize that in the very course of their denying any meaning to Reality they are smuggling in such meaning through the door of human personality which they extol. Note, e.g. Guyan's statement "Life, like fire only maintains itself by communicating itself." (Guyan, p. 210) There is enough in this statement to satisfy any theologian.

It seems to me that for the spiritualization of conduct the best approach is that of Wieman who defines God as that aspect of the world which if lived up to makes for the maximum of happiness (this is my own paraphrase). In addition it is necessary to foster faith in the ultimate improvement of human life as interpreted by Hobhouse toward the end of his "Social Development."

II. For the process of socializing conduct it is necessary to study in detail the various types of relationships into which our lives are interwoven and to apply the following three principles (1) Elicit the best in those to whom we are related in our functioning (Adler). (2) Aim to achieve that result by creating favorable conditions (Cabot), and (3) the maximum of cooperation compatible with maximum of freedom (Hobhouse).

III. In rationalizing conduct we perform an affirmative process when we organize our own tendencies around our "true interest" (McDougall) and (2) a negative process when we prevent pseudo-rationalizing (Robinson, Freud, Coe, etc.) Only after we have built up a world outlook and a system of social interests are we in a position to control our own tendencies especially the most recalcitrant one of fear. ~~McDougall~~ McDongall, e.g. in discussing modifications of original dispositions makes what he considers "a simple practical suggestion. Let him who finds it difficult to get the better of a tendency keep a money box or a pocket for charity, and let him immediately slip a coin into it every time he detects the stirring of the forbidden tendency." (p.45) Is it not evident that unless the person in question had built up the social

attitude of giving charity he would not be likely to keep a money box. Or when (as on p. 47) he advocates resort to laughter which according to Bergson is a great instrument of social discipline, must we not assume that the person in question has been sufficiently socialized to render himself amenable to laughter as such a discipline?

* * *

Saturday night, August 4, 1934

I think I've struck a gold vein...

The objective in the management of life can be nothing else than the enhancement of life, the heightening of the vital energies, etc. (Cf. Lyman's conception of religion in the opening passage of his book, The Meaning of Religion) But life is like a damned up stream which only requires that the obstacles to be removed to flow forth freely. The main obstacles to human life being 1) fear, 2) frustration and 3) boredom, the objective of life management might well be stated as consisting of the task of removing these obstacles. The human being having memory an imagination which conjures up infinite possibilities of mishap, and numerous tendencies which are forever in conflict, he is forever in danger of living only part of his life, of being divided against himself. The problem with him is in reality how to achieve that wholeness (p.219) that fulness of living which the animal and the child experience. This is what authoritative religion has tried to give to man through its element of faith .

The mistake which all the ethicists since Socrates have made has been to assume that it is possible to build up on rational grounds a conception of "ought" which the individual would feel is compelling as the "ought of authoritative religion. They should have frankly realized that such an attempt was (like trying to put a round peg in a square hole) inherently self-contradictory. Once we depart from the heteronomous "must" or "ought" we are dealing with good and evil in a contingent sense, contingent upon the voluntary acceptance of the objective. Kant's statement that

there is no good but a good will is arrant nonsense.

In addition, these ethicists committed the blunder of trying to build up systems of ethics with the individual, abstracted from his environment, as the ethical unit. Dewey has demonstrated (in his book on Habit) the meaninglessness of dealing with the tendencies of the individual apart from the environment, but he has failed to supply a method of treatment that would prove more satisfactory. His and Tufts Ethics - as far as I know it - doesn't seem to get anywehre either. It all started with that overpraised motto "Know Thyself" of ancient Greece. Suppose the dynamo were conscious of itself, would it be helped much by the advice to know itself apart from the electro-magnetic energy by which it operates? Would it not be better advised if it were told to get itself into communion - so to speak - with that energy and not to break that association if it wants to continue functioning?

* * *

Sunday, August 5, 1934

This page was written while "Aida" was coming over the radio. To try to think against the announcer's blabber was like trying to sail against a strong headwind.

I think that the following formulation of the objectives of life-management is even better than that suggested by Lyman in the opening parag. of his Meaning of Religion: To render life assuring (free from fear), interesting (free from boredom) and fulfilling (free from frustration).

It is only when viewed thus that the problem of living can receive a realistic ethical treatment. Take e.g. the capacity of appreciation with all that such capacity implies, or the capacity to risk or adventure as an essential in learning to overcome fear (Cf. Nietzsche's "live dangerously") suggests genuine planning so ordering our lives as to get within sight of the above named objectives.

I understand that there goes around the saying about my book to the effect that there is no God and Kaplan is his prophet. I suspect that Rev. Dr. se solamifa Pool started it.

* * *

Friday, August 10, 1934

On Wednesday morning I sent off the corrected proof of text and translation of Mesillat Yesharim. I've been fussing with this thing on and off for the last eighteen years. Will it ever see the light?

I have read through "Nijinsky" for material on my new undertaking. I ask myself what does that book teach me concerning the meaning of life and the problem of conduct. If it doesn't teach me, it at least stirs up a number of questions which we are so apt to ignore, because they are very troublesome and don't admit of an answer.

What can one learn from the book with regard to 1) orientation, 2) socialization, and 3) rationalization? a) The art for which he lived was significant to him because he regarded it as a medium of serving God. His deeply religious nature seems to have contributed to the deepening of his art. It never occurred to him to take God to task for the trouble he endured.

But the most staggering tragedy of human life, the one which it is most difficult to square with an unqualifiedly affirmative attitude toward Reality, is insanity -- at least from the point of view of the observer, or of the relatives and friends of the one afflicted. Yet with the adoption of Wieman's conception of God, and of the conception of evil as developed by Lyman (toward the end of his book) it should be possible to achieve an orientation that would help a man organize his life morally and rationally.

What about Diaghileff? He is typical of the rootless, disoriented worshippers of art for art's sake, who live for the moment.

He undoubtedly has his ideals. He loved Russia for its great cultural values. But what rational person would not rather be insane with Nijinsky than sane with Diaghileff? I attribute the distortion of his life to his distorted perspective on life. With him man existed for art instead of art for man. This implies that an orientation to serve as a background for a moral and rational life must see in human personality the supreme value to which other values are but means.

2) From the standpoint of socialization, the principle of evoking the best is limited in its application to art; this accounts for the failure of that principle to lead to true socialization. The wrong twist in the orientation of most of the artists is responsible for the miscarriage of that principle of socialization. Nijinsky is the exception, as one might expect. Hence the mutual jealousies and pettiness in their attitude toward one another.

The identification of art with national sentiment both to the advantage and disadvantage of the former is evident in most of the characters. Under the category of disadvantage I refer to the various strikes against German music during the war.

3) Rationalization -- There is nothing in the book that gives one an idea of the inner life of the various characters described to throw any light on the question: To what extent did they succeed in overcoming fear, frustration and boredom? The author, Mrs. N. seems to have labored continually under a sense of fear that her happiness couldn't last long. She would always discover sinister omens of one kind or another. The element of superstition is quite prominent in her character. The old pagan idea of the gods being envious of happy mortals crops up in her. That idea undoubtedly reflects a most universal trait of human nature and should be treated at length.

Dinin called last Wednesday and reported on the joint project in which he and I are engaged. Fundamentally it is attempt to plead with the Jewish Communists not to apply to Jewish life and religion the tactics of hate, contempt and denunciation which Communism calls for in the case of the various nationalisms and religions. My idea is that the Jewish nationhood is in no sense committed to the capitalistic order of society, because it lacks political organization. On the contrary it is the victim of capitalism. Jews as individuals may have benefitted by the bourgeois revolution, but as members of the Jewish nation they have had to pay the price of apostacy in one form or another. Likewise with the Jewish religion; it is ridiculous to compare it in any way with the other historical religions each with its organized church and fixed creed. The Jewish religion is at present entering on a new stage of development. It is unfettered by creed or organization and can be made into a social agency answering to the needs of a classless society.

I put at Dinin's disposal a number of pamphlets in Yiddish attacking Judaism and asked him to give a summary of the Communist arguments against Judaism. It was this he reported on, and I suggested to him the general plan to be followed in the book on which we were working.

* * *

Sunday, August 11, 1934

Treat yourself as environment to be moulded.

In orientation, faith; in socialization, love; in individualization, reason.

In the management of life the objective is the maximum development of personality. Personality which must, accordingly constitute the standard of all values, since it is the criterion of all failure and success, should be defined as the progressive synthesis of the maximum of cooperation and the maximum of individuation. This synthesis is the characteristic trait or ability of the human being. Because he can achieve it, because in achieving it he experiences the greatest abundance of life because it gives him self-respect and dignity, therefore he must strive for it.

Whatever phase of life or nature makes for the development of personality is sacred. God is the sum of all those aspects of Reality that make for personality. Hence the bond between man and God.

The antithesis between #nature" and "spirit" is the antithesis between those forces which are indifferent to personality and those which support it.

I believe the topic of "The Management of Life" is now ripe for detailed treatment.

* * *

Monday, August 12, 1934

I begin to realize that the fundamental error in what I have been attempting as well as an all all the ethical and religious systems has been to presume to cure all ills of body and mind of individual and group by some panacea. They should have confined themselves to the human differentia and not to the whole of the human being. When I have a toothache no amount of ethics and religion can cure me of it (incidentally, I think I am getting one), but the spirit in which I am going to take it is determined by my personality or my human differentia. Religion and ethics should not attempt to solve the problem of human happiness and misery in all their aspects but only insofar as they are determined by the human differentia or personality.

It is a common fallacy with thinkers to identify the part with the whole, and the differentia with the essence. The Greek philosophers having discovered in reason the human differentia concluded that reason was the whole or essence of man, and that by achieving the fulness of reason man achieved the purpose of his being, happiness, immortality or what not.

In the power of appreciation the human being attains a degree of cooperation which goes very far toward developing his personality. By appreciating a thing he allows that thing to enter his mind and enhance it. In worshipping God he enters into cooperation with the universe from the standpoint of personality making miens. In the following poem called "Pied Beauty" Gerald (Manley) Hopkins of England expresses appreciation which rises to the plane of worship:

Glory be to God for dappled things --
For skies as couple-colour'd as a brindled cow;
For rose-moles all in stipple upon trout that swim;
Fresh fire-coal chestnut falls; finches wings;
Landscapes plotted and pieced - fold, follow, and plough
And all trades, their gear and tackle and trim.
All things counter, original, spare and strange;
Whatever is fickle, freckled (who knows how?)
With swift, slow; sweet, sour; adazzle, dim;
He fathers-forth whose beauty is past change:
Praise Him.

Modern scientific thinking is responsible for nullifying differentia by its emphasis on the common element in things and living beings. It thus becomes guilty of the fallacy that the essence of a thing is to be found in that which it has in common with other things.

My ideas on the subject I'm working on have become further crystallized. This time it was a statement in Edman's "Human Traits" that acted as a catalytic agent. He quotes Aristotle to the effect that the knowledge of what is good for man must be based on what man is. Edman then proceeds with the conventional psychological description of human nature, as though psychology could give an adequate conception of man. If I hadn't worked out the lecture on Jewish ethics last February, which I gave at the Seminary, I wouldn't have appreciated the significance of Aristotle's statement and it would not have acted in the way it did.

The following is the plan of the course:

Intro: The purpose of all religious and ethical teaching and exhortation is to indicate and urge what is good for man. Until recently most people assumed that the knowledge of what is good for man could be obtained from authoritative sources. Traditional religion taught that only God could know and reveal what is good for man since it was He who created man. Man is too circumscribed in his knowledge to find out the truth by himself.

A summary of the contents of such knowledge is given in Mesillat Yesharim, etc.

That program of life has been upset -- cf. Preface to Morals by Lipmann.

Since the answer given by traditional religion is no longer satisfactory the only alternative left is to derive it from the study of what man is.

This does not mean that traditional religion is to be discarded. Since it was the outgrowth of human nature, it should be possible to transpose its answer into terms of the answer based on the study of what man is.

What is man? The ancient philosophers answered in terms of the human differentia. Having discovered the capacity for abstract thinking they elevated that into the supreme end of human life. The moderns usually in terms of what man has in common with the sub-human.

The correct type of answer has to be one in which the differentia is not isolated from the base of that which man has in common with the rest of nature but understood as arising out of that common element and constituting a unique quality thereof. The fact about man of which this is true is his Personality.

Personality is the progressive synthesis of maximum of co-operation and maximum of individualization.

What is good for man must therefore mean what is good for the development of personality. Happiness is the emotional state accompanying the progressive achievement of personality. "The empirical work of happiness is concentration, enthusiasm of action, To the happy man things and deeds appear worth while." (Hocking)

To know the meaning of Personality is to know it in terms of

I. Orientation, values, sacredness, appreciation, godhood, history, emergence of soul, progress, etc.

II. Socialization, love, property, various relationships, indirect influence through conditioning, etc.

III. Individualization, harmony of impulses, habits, integration, etc. and conquest of fear, frustration and boredom. (p.224)

* * *

Tuesday, August 13, 1934

Mrs. Ed. Epstein came to see mother who has been staying with us these last twelve days. Even she seems to be unhappy, or rather far from happy, because she has to stay with her children. The root of her

unhappiness, I gather from her conversation, is that she doesn't feel she is wanted. I gave her a long lecture the point of which was that we must so live as to feel we are needed. To feel thus we do not have to depend upon others wanting us, but to do those things which we know to be good for them. I realize that if she and others in her position were to act upon that advice they might interfere with the lives of their children, and it would only cause friction. But as an antidote to the complex that we are not wanted and carried out to a moderate extent such advice should be helpful to all concerned.

Personality produces the perspective of the heart. Perspective is a distortion of nature viewed apart from man yet part of that very nature which harbors man.

* * *

Thursday, August 16, 1934

Yesterday we all went to the city to meet Judith and Ira on their return from Palestine. It seems that they are not altogether happy at what they found there -- social, political and spiritucal chaos. The socialist-fascist struggle which is going on throughout the world today is liable to wreck this last attempt of the Jewish people to survive. It is in keeping with Marxian dialectic to find Rabbi Kook, the Mizrachi andthe rest of the obscurantists ranged with the Revisionists. Between the Revisionists with their ludicrous attitude toward the Arabs and the British Government and the Histadrut with its material and spiritual impotence to swing the greater part of the Jews interested in Palestine, God knows what will become of the hope to have a Jewish national homeland in Palestine.

This chaos is the price we Jews are paying for the failure of our leaders to prepare us for the eventuality of being able to re-establish our ancient homeland. For centuries those leaders fed us on messianic mirages, and when the time for realistic thinking and planning arrived they left us in the lurch.

I have been harboring for a long time this fear of tragic failure of our people in Palestine, though I naturally find it hard to admit this fear to myself, much more to others. In fact, I have gone so far as to readjust my thinking on the whole subject of Palestine so as to make the continuance of Jewish life in the diaspora compatible at least temporarily with the most disheartening developments in Palestine. I refer to thought which I expressed at the conference of the Council for the Advancement of American-Jewish Life a year ago at the CJI camp when I said that the main significance of the Palestinian project consisted in its teaching the Jews to effect the transition as Jews from other worldliness to this-worldliness. But down deep in my own mind I know that I am only trying to prevent my whole thought structure from toppling. With Palestine out of the picture a this-worldly Jewish life is utterly inconceivable. No matter how hopeless the present situation looks, if I want to continue believing in and working for a Jewish future I must with the last ounce of my will power determine and urge others to determine that Palestine must succeed.

I realize fully the vacillating and paradoxical character of my attitude toward Palestine yet I am sure it is a perfectly normal experience for if it weren't how could it exemplify so accurately Hocking's analysis of happiness? (The Meaning of God in Human Experience p. 492).

"Psychologically speaking, happiness may now be described as the continuous <u>undivided</u> consent of my whole idea to the experience or activity at hand; and the empirical mark of happiness is concentration or enthusiasm of action. To the happy man things and deeds appear worthwhile; his actions meet the mark...

"Happiness on this showing does certainly not depend immediately on external things at all, but upon our own inward mode of dealing with them. If it were within our power to throw the whole force of our idea at will upon any object, there could be no content of experience however hideous or painful, or spiritually grievous, which could make us unhappy. But is it possible or even conceivable that attention could be brought within the will? There is something paradoxical even in such a supposition. For if it were true, then no event of failure could dethrone anyone's happiness; that is we should be unable to give whole-hearted attention to the enterprise; and hence, by hypothesis we should be unhappy. For we can give ourselves with but half a will to undertakings whose failure can alter no real value. It seems a condition of happiness that happiness should be destroyable by failure; otherwise we could hardly treat any present task as worth the effort of our whole will."

* * *

Friday, August 17, 1934

The following ideas about personality are essential to the analysis of the problem:

1) Personality is the progressive integration of interests.

2) While it may not be easy to prove that the acquisition of personality results in happiness, it is a fact of common experience that happiness is impossible without the acquisition of personality.

There may be satisfaction of separate interests, but the human being demands that higher type of satisfaction which comes with the harmonization of interests.

3) The need for integration of interests is the aspect of individuality in personality; the nature of most of the interests, in which man's dependence upon others is revealed, points to the aspect of cooperation in personality.

* * *

Sunday, August 19, 1934

As soon as we were through with Sabbath dinner yesterday, Naomi asked "Can we go to the beach with the car?" "You can do whatever you want," I said, "but it's not my idea of spending a Sabbath afternoon." Then the storm broke loose. For over two hours Judith, Hadassah, Naomi and Selma, reenforced by Ira, kept up a barrage of argument under which, I must confess, I finally crumpled up. They demolished my defenses of the customary restrictions on the Sabbath and incidentally also those of kashrut.

After I rose from the table I went to take Mrs. Epstein for a walk and it was the same story all over again. Her children had all gone to the beach with their car, but not without having pleaded with her to come along with them. She too would not yield. Why? Habit.

(p.227)

"Ashes will satisfy a man who is so duped by a delusion that he cannot pull himself up by asking 'Am I not holding to something false and vain?'"

(Moffatt's translation)

The foregoing text struck me between the eyes as I did my Bible chore this morning.

I was very much exasperated when I came across the following notice of my book in the new Seminary Register: The Macmillan Company has recently published a book of essays on 'Judaism as a Civilization'. The implication is that it is a fragmentary collection of ideas instead of what it claims to be, an organized and consistent system. This notice was probably written by Finkelstein. It may be that his inability to express himself properly led him to formulate that misstatement, but I cannot help suspecting an element of malice in the published notice.

* * *

Monday, August 20, 1934

While reading Royce's "Sources of Religious Insight", especially pages 122-123 it occurred to me that Royce's philosophy was the same as Hermann Cohen's. It would be interesting to find out to what extent Cohen influenced Royce. It is not likely that Cohen - as a German - would be influenced by an American.

Jewish nationalism as I have been trying to interpret it is a concrete illustration of the principle of loyalty to loyalty as Royce defines it.

* * *

Wednesday, August 23, 1934

I read today E. A. Robinson's "Rembrandt to Rembrandt." It moved me to tears.

* * *

Thursday, August 23, 1934

Is the Seminary forever to be the roadhog now with Cyrus and later with Louis at the wheel, impeding my progress?

This subject I'm working on - I haven't yet found the right name for it - is developing into a kind of anatomy of characters in literature. It helps me discover the significant parts of their structure.

* * *

Friday, August 24, 1934

As I see it now the problem which I am trying to solve is: Along what lines shall we direct the evolution of the human being? Whereas in the past the moralist addressed himself to accepted standards and norms, and issued categorical imperatives to his audience to attain a goal which allegedly they had strayed away from (hence the concept (p.228) he must now help his contemporaries along new lines of development. He must direct the course of human evolution. He must call forth latent powers and stimulate new potentialities. He must point to what man can do, relying

upon man to feel obliged to do all he can do, all that it is within him to do. Nietzsche's approach was right, but his conception of the coming man was all wrong.

* * *

Monday, August 27, 1934

I am back to the routine of preparing sermons. Yesterday morning and this morning Leon B. Hurwitz and Signer pumped me for ~~what~~ material for Rosh Hashanah and this afternoon I met the Seminary students and graduates for the purpose of helping them with their preaching for the coming High Holidays. As a result I now feel all fagged out, not so much because of the physical effort I expended as the mental strain of having to kindle wet wood, so to speak. This time the Seminary men irritated me with their foolish questions. I was trying to explain the idea that with so much in the world nowadays tending to negate life's meaning, it is important to help our people retain their faith in the significance and worthwhileness of life. The two communist sympathizers, Bokser and Isaac Klein at once began heckling me and insisting that the first requisite to finding life significant is to have a job. Hence, I suppose, they would want me to tell them how they could help the members of the congregations find jobs. I had to point out to them that the government with all its machinery is unable to solve the problem of jobs before they were convinced that it is necessary to deal with the subject how to find life meaningful, even though we can't help people find jobs. But time and again some one would come out with the question: All that has to do with people in general. Wherein is that idea Jewish? At this I was too dumbfounded to reply in consecutive sentences. I blurted out incoherent statements. I just spluttered. The deeply ingrained habit of thought that ~~Jews~~ Jews constitute a different species of human beings with problems all their own prevents many, if not most of the Seminary graduates, from thinking rationally when it comes to Jews and Judaism.

* * *

Friday, August 31, 1934

How unjust the judgment of even the great literary critics! In this week's Saturday Review a certain Leonard Bacon gives a rehash of the laudations which, in my opinion, have been undeservedly heaped on Keat's poetry and characterizes Keats as "second in gifts only to the greatest of all poets." For the twentieth time, after reading the article, I picked up Keats' poetry and tried to find what all that batting was about only to come across again a mellifluous plethora of adolescent fancies of a highly sensitive imagination kindled to fever heat by love and disease. I, for one, prefer the American poet E. A. Robinson. I cannot read any random page of his poetry without being moved and exalted, whereas Keats has nothing to say to me. If I had anything to do with literary criticism I would consider Keats so much below Robinson that I would not even brackett their names.

With human activity depending so much upon taste, what prospect is there of bringing any kind of order into it? Men's tastes are hopelessly divergent, and for the most part, apt to favor things irrational and insipid. With Christian Science Churches and movie houses croweded to capacity I wonder how many centuries will have to pass before human beings will deserve to be called rational. Every time I see one of the popular movie plays I conclude that Mencken's characterization of the American public as the "great booboisie" cannot be wrong, else how could the movie magnates afford so to flout and insult ordinary intelligence.

* * *

Tuesday, September 4, 1934

I am still puttering with the Messillat. I thought I was through with the revision of the galley proofs, but the secretary of the Jewish Publication Society sent them back to me by mistake. I am glad he did, because I found it necessary to make a few additional changes in the translation. Now I am worried that in the interests of English style I may have strayed far from the original.

In the course of the work on the Holiday sermons with Hurwitz, Signer and Jacob Grossman, Hurwitz told the following story which I am recording because it is typical of the difficulties with which Jewish life has to cope. Nathan Goldstein is a successful lawyer who until recently had practically no share in Jewish activities. His wife who comes from a rabbinical family, became acquainted with Leon B. Hurwitz and asked him to interest her husband in the work of the synagogue. When Hurwitz visited him in his magnificently appointed office on Broadway he opened up his heart to Hurwitz and admitted that he often felt as though life had lost its savor. Pointing from his window to the cemetery of the Trinity Church he expressed his envy of those who found in death surcease from their trouble.

After considerable coaxing and arguing Hurwitz succeeded in persuading Goldstein to accept the presidency of the struggling congregation of which he (Hurwitz) is the rabbi. Goldstein's first step was to arrange for some affair to raise money for the congregation. In the meantime the Zionist Organization drew Goldstein into its activities and Emanuel Newman urged him to attend the Congress at Prague. He consulted Hurwitz whether he should go to Prague and Hurwitz advised him by all means to go, because that would raise his prestige with the congregation. Goldstein went to Prague and there he met the Zionist leaders, among them Weitzmann and Lord Melchet. The latter persuaded him to accept the presidency of the Maccabiad for the United States. The effect of these new contacts and responsibilities on Goldstein was not only to crowd out his recently won interest in the synagogue, but to render the synagogue entirely superfluous in his estimate. Instead of trying to help Hurwitz upbuild the congregation, he wanted to disband the congregation and to get Hurwitz to give up the rabbinate.

The case of H. L. Simmons with whose aid I organized the SAJ and who was its chairman for a number of years is very similar to that of Goldstein. It was I who acted as liaison officer between Weitzmann and Simmons when the Keren Hayesod Campaign started in this country. Before long

Simmons began telling me that I was foolish in confining myself to so small and insignificant a group of people as those who constituted the SAJ. His contact with Weitzmann destroyed his interest in the SAJ. He was apparently out for prestige and that he could not get from the SAJ. Ultimately this led to his retirement from it.

I was in the city today. Everything that happened was cheering. I got a letter from Solomon Goldman to whom I had sent a copy of the book early in June and from whom I hadn't heard since. I had been very much annoyed by his lack of ordinary civility and by his failure to cooperate with me in pushing the Council for the Advancement of Jewish Life. I see now that he had been very much under the weather and it is only lately that he has recovered. I was heartened by his enthusiastic reaction to my book.

While in the office of the SAJ I met Miss Schmuckler - one of the teachers in the school. She brought very warm regards from Ludwig Lewisohn, whom she met in Burlington, N. H. and his apologies for not having acknowledged receipt of my book. He told her he expected to write me a long letter after he has read it through.

At the office of the United Synagogue I learned that all the 2500 copies of the "Supplementary Prayers" had been sold out, and an additional thousand ordered to be printed.

For the first time in my experience, some of the men who took part in the sermon seminars suggested ideas of their own which helped both to clarify and correct mine. Rabbi Feder made the point that it is part of human nature not only to take from the world but to give to it. This enabled me to emphasize an idea of mine to the effect that frustration is experienced not only when one has to suppress his physical hunger but also when for some reason he cannot or does not give expression to his social and spiritual hungers.

Rabbi Fisher of Arverne - a man, by the way, whom I like very much because of his sincerity and devotion to his calling - contributed an important idea with regard to what constitutes a true understanding of Jewish life. I had stressed the need of recognizing the organic relationship among the various phases, and having the synagogue function chiefly as a means of stressing this relationship. Fisher, however, raised the point that it would be asking the impossible of the average Jew to expect him to participate in all Jewish activities. The value of regarding Judaism as a civilization (this is my own addition) is in making it possible for the Jew to feel that he is contributing to Jewish life no matter what phase of it he fosters. To this I added the proviso that he realize the place of his contribution in the context of the totality of Jewish life.

"You try to be more than you are by nature and you kill something in yourself and become much less." I'm so tired of all this rubbish about the higher life and moral and intellectual progress and living for ideals and all the rest of it. It all leads to death. Just as living for money. Christians and moralists and cultured esthetics and bright young scientists and smilesian (?) business men - all the poor little human frogs trying to blow themselves into bulls of pure spirituality, pure idealism, pure efficiency, pure conscious intelligence and just going pop, ceasing to be anything but the fragments of a little frog - decaying fragments at that.

The foregoing passage from Aldous Huxley's Point Counterpoint (p. 399) nearly knowked me off my feet when I read it last night. But now that I recall the idea which occurred to me the other day to the effect that the human voice is undergoing a process of evolution - the evolution of personality - I see no point to Huxley's ridicule of the human being trying to be more than he is by nature. He might as well ridicule the tadpole for trying to shed its tail, or the caterpillar wishing to become a butterfly, for no doubt some yearning must be felt by these creatures to be transformed

into something more than what they are. In man the analogous yearning finds expression in spirituality, idealism or the higher life. For once Huxley (for he undoubtedly speaks through Kampion) is all wrong.

* * *

Wednesday, September 5, 1934

More than once did I think that I had gotten hold of a workable idea for the course at the Seminary this academic year, only to find that it would land me in a bog of verbal constructs and distinctions. What I need is an idea which might enable me so to grasp the problem of how to live as to point at least to some helpful solution. Perhaps now I have a right to say Eureka. The following is to be the approach.

The problem of human conduct has been dealt with in traditional religion from the standpoint of divinely revealed truth and guidance. Philosophers have dealt with it from the standpoint of self-realization as achievable through self-direction and self-culture. The method to be tried now is that of dealing with it as a problem in the art of living together. Essentially this is what is meant by civilization. (Wouldn't it be interesting, if after having written on Judaism as a Civilization I would have something worthwhile to say on Civilization as an Art, or the Art of Living Together?) This leads naturally to the question: what shall constitute the objective the attainment of which might serve as a criterion of the art of living together? The answer is the personality of all those who live together. The discussion thus divides itself into the following topics.

I. Introduction: The Art of Living Together (in which the above idea is to be elaborated.)

II. What is Man: The definitions of religion (the image of God), of the ancient philosophers (a rational animal) of the modern philosophers (an animal). The true answer a person.

III. The Evolution of Personality (as a philosophy of history and as setting froth the function of the moralist).

IV. Orientation

V. Socialization

VI. Individualization (see p. 310 this typescript)

It was the failure to realize that the problem of human conduct was not just a problem of living but of living together that kept me all this time in the rut of philosophic ethics.

We are moving back into the city today. We have spent a very pleasant summer here at New Rochelle. We rented the house from Mr. Gluck, the principal of the public school where Hadassah has been substituting. Mr. Gluck has been very kind to us and rented it for the amount that it cost him for the two months - $250. In addition we paid $175 plus incidentals for membership in the Westchester Yacht Club in Mamaroneck in order to have comfortable bathing facilities. Fortunately Hadassah is able to drive a car and we got my brother-in-law Louis' car because he couldn't use it himself. This made it possible for us to get to the club without any trouble, and Hadassah Naomi and Selma did not have to be confined to the house.

As for myself, I have not wasted any time and my health has on the whole been good - so that all in all we have reason to be grateful for the way we spent the summer.

* * *

Friday, September 7, 1934

Wednesday night I gave xxx a talk on my book before a group of Menorah friends led by Henry Hurwitz in New Rochelle. The meeting took place at the home of the Derektors (Sam and Lillian Unterberg) and was attended by about 70 men and women both young and middle aged, intellectuals, intellectual climbers and a few students. The last were brought by their mothers or fathers in the hope that I would explain to them why they should be Jews.

I gave a resume of the first and last chapters of my book. This took me from 9:35 to 10:15. Then came the discussion which lasted till about 11:40. While all the questioners agreed with my diagnosis they wouldn't hear of the cure. They expected some sugar coated pill that would work magic whereas I advised them to betake themselves to a different climate. They seemed to imply that if I could put Jewish survival on the basis of some cosmopolitan type of religion with a bit of effective magic thrown in, I would be the kind of spiritual physician they would patronize. The statement that Jewish communal life must be completely reorganized in order that our children might sense something of the very reality and atmosphere of Jewish living instead of having to live in a vacuum, all that sounded like Greek to them. Even a woman like Mrs. Ed. Epstein who claims that she is a disciple of mine, and who was present at the meeting complained to me next day that I missed my opportunity in addressing those people. She considered my entire approach too abstract.

Personally I can't see how it is possible for me to sound other than abstract to those who have nothing Jewish about them or in their consciousness except the stigma of birth and the fact that they are identified as Jews by the rest of the world. To me who is tone deaf a discussion of any musical composition must sound abstract.

At the funeral of Mrs. B. D. Kaplan, the mother of Dr. Ira Kaplan (my nephew by marriage) at which, thank God, I did not have to officiate, Rabbis E. L. Solomon and Lookstein delivered the eulogies. (Lookstein, a little man with a moon face on a samovar like body, wore a cutaway with the coat-tails reaching down almost to the ankles; Solomon with a triangular face ending in a gray blond goatee and somewhat taller and much thinner than Lookstein wore a sack coat). Solomon spoke first. In his captatio benevolentiae (the one thing I learned about from Drachman's course in Homiletics 35 years ago when Solomon was my classmate) he stated that in deference to

to the wishes of the mourners, and in order not to make them feel more poignantly their great loss, he would refrain from speaking at length. How great their loss was the record left behind by the kind loving woman, the mother in Israel, etc was an evidence of. From that point on he recounted her virtues as a wife and mother and friend etc. etc. and all that was due to her innate loyalty which she proved among other things by the fact that though he had ceased to be her official rabbi she remembered him by a kind letter every holiday that came round (by which he probably alluded to the fact that she sent him a check). Then came Lookstein. He too said that he could add but little to the eloquent words of the previous speaker. There was only one thing he wanted to say and then he let loose a long string of talk about the old fashioned religion which the mother not only practiced herself but succeeded in transmitting to her children. That religion was based on the faith that through prayer you can get what you pray for. Thus she prayed for her son when he went to Europe for a cure. She was certain it would help and it helped. Her prayerbook had pages turned down to two passages; one was the (p.234) and the other was

When her children left her bedside for the last time they went into the room adjoining and prayed the and stressed the petition of .

I am sure that the family of the departed hung on the words of those two rabbis. Those words flattered their vanity and their superstition. The bystanders must also have been mesmerized by the glib phrases and the mournful cadences of the speakers every one of whose words in my opinion was but an additional nail in the coffin of the hope that the Jews might readjust themselves spiritually and intellectually to the world in which they lived.

* * *

Sunday, September 9, 1934

The sermon which I have worked out for tomorrow, the first day of Rosh Hashanah, is based on the idea that the comparison of life to a book

should remind us that if we want life to have meaning for us we must link up our lives with those forces which make for the unity of mankind and the development of personality.

When I read this morning about the disaster on the steamer "Morro Castle" which caught fire off the New Jersey Coast and that 250 people lost their lives, my train of thought about life being like a book received a severe jolt and was almost thrown off the track. In order to continue the run I had to add the following thought: The disaster has as little to do with God (as I understand that term) as the fact that a passage in the copy of a book is blotted out through some accident. In the mind of the author that passage lives. So if among the number who perished there were men and women who contributed to the meaning of life they became part of the eternal context which lives in the mind of God, irrespective of what happened to their bodies.

We do many things not because we deliberately will them or see any value to them but because not ~~[illegible]~~ to do them stirs up thought and raises problems which we are not prepared to solve.

Ira and I paid a condolence call on the Kaplans who were sitting <u>shiva</u> for their mother. There were no visitors present and I wondered how we could make conversation. We no sooner took our seats than Sam, the oldest of the sons, happened to mention Isaac Cohen whom he spoke of as Itzele Cohen. This furnished him the clue for a series of reminiscenes about the Jews who in the 1890's worshipped in the 67th St. synagogue (Zichron Ephraim) between Third and Lexington Aves. "Do you know he said what made a hero in those days of Itzele Cohen? There came around an itenerant rabbi who called himself David Abarbanel and claimed to be a descendant of King David. The German Jews (or as he called them "the Daitshukes") had Rabbi Drachman as their authority

and they, led by Weil, Drachman's father-in-law, always opposed these itinerant rabbis. The Russian-Polish Jews had to have their own Rav, because they wouldn't rely upon Drachman when it comes to questions of "kashrus" or other ritual matters. They had a rabbi by the name Notele Hurwitz, a meek and non-committal person who wouldn't pass any opinion on these visiting rabbis. On one occasion Rabbi David Abarbanel, who was lodged at Hurwitz's house and who took his meals at the homes of the Oshinskys and the Kaplans, the richest of the Russian-Polish group, was heckled with questions pertaining to some Talmudic pilpul which he had argued. Isaac Cohen succeeded in putting a question to the rabbi that stumped him. From that time on Isaac Cohen's fame as an exceptional young man grew and augmented his matrimonial chances. It is to that he owes his having married the only daughter of Bachrach, the sister of a number of brothers all of whom were among the most wealthy Russian-Polish Jews who had immigrated to America in the early 80's.

Many of the Jewish families which constituted that group had from six to twelve children each and on a Sabbath or festival the fathers would have all the sons come to the synagogue. Old man Goldberg would have all of his eleven sons sit with him. The echo of a smack in the face would indicate the quarter where one of the boys came late to services.

What all that had to do with condolence I don't know. But I at least am grateful for the little etching of bygone N.Y. Jewish life, which Sam Kaplan's conversation limmed on my mind.

* * *

Wednesday, September 13, 1934

The seats in the SAJ synagogue brought in $11,000 these High Holidays despite their early date and despite the fact that a considerable number of the members (I think at least 60 families) remained out of town, mainly to save the cost of the seats, and perhaps also to avoid making a contribution to Kol Nidre night toward the maintenance of the activities. In many

cases these evasions were unavoidable because of financial losses sustained and the unlikelihood of immediate improvement in their economic condition. But in a number of cases there is no such excuse. They simply avail themselves of the general demoralization in communal life to shake off any sense of responsibility for the maintenance of the synagogue. What I marvel at is that with all this growing indifference there should still be found a group of Jews who part with what is after all a considerable sum for the sake of participating in activities that have neither economic nor esthetic interest for them. It seems to me at this moment that perhaps they intuitively feel that through this participation in the service they are endowed with a dignity which they would otherwise be lacking.

This leads me to take up the challenge which is so effectively worded in the August number of Opinion under the heading "Jews Face Fascism." The author of the article, Rebecca Pitts, calls upon the Jews who wish to retain their cultural values, to throw in their lot with Communism, because it is their only hope against anti-Semitism. Her argument is all the more alluring because she concedes the cultural value of Judaism and allows it a place in the reconstructed economy. "The policy of the proletarian revolution," she says, "(in the Soviet Union and everywhere) is always; ~~Nationalism~~ 'National in form and proletarian in content'. Complete cultural autonomy is the result. In a truly free America, if the Jews desired it, a genuine folk life might emerge -- such a folk life has proved impossible in bourgeois America."

The trouble with her analysis of the situation, it seems to me is the same as with communist thinking in general, namely the tendency to oversimplify the problem. With all my bitterness against the profit system I cannot for the life of me come to think of the class struggle as a struggle between two dismetrically opposed camps. There is also the psychological fact that people hold on to the old not because they believe that it is the best, but because they don't know that the new would be better. The fear of the

untried is not something that exists in some and is altogether wanting in others, so that it might serve as a basis of distinguishing one class from another. Likewise the division into haves and have-nots is an unreal one. There is a third group which consists of those who don't have what they have because at the slightest turn of fortune they are apt to lose what they have. There are people who are absolutely poor, who believe in individual enterprise, and well-to-do who would readily part with their wealth for any system that would free them from the worries and responsibilities of their wealth. And what of the fact that there is hardly an individual who is homogeneous within himself. Most thinking people of the so called middle-class have the class struggle going on within their own souls.

It is this oversimplification that leads Rebecca Pitts to make the following questionable statement: "It is futile to look for unity among the Jewish people. They are like the non-Jewish world, hopelessly divided, lined up in the hostile camps of bourgeoisie and proletariat." One can understand the contention that the national unity of bourgeoisie and proletariat in the non-Jewish world is unreal, because the bourgeoisie use such national unity only to exploit the proletariat, as mill hands and cannon fodder. But wherein does the Jewish bourgeoisie need the Jewish proletariat. On the contrary, Jewish mill owners have always preferred gentile mill hands, because the latter are more likely to be docile. Nor are there any imperialistic schemes for which the Jewish bourgeoisie should seek out anything in common with the Jewish proletariat. Yet is it not a fact that the former have always recognized that they belong to one group and that they owe them a measure of responsibility -- however small? The Jewish bourgeois represented by the Joint Distribution Committee that helped the Jewish proletariat settle on the land in Russia could scarcely be said to be helplessly divided from the latter.

There is something besides economic interests in human life and association. To the human being qua human being dignity is even more important than bread. This is something that all these communists forget. Such dignity the human being gets from belonging to a group which has personality to it, a historic entity, a nation with a culture or a church with a tradition. Jews who drop out of Jewish life must for that reason join the church. Those, however, who are not prepared to go that far are compelled to look to their people for that dignity which only a tradition can confer.

Hence, the answer to my original question is: Jews, however far they from an active participation in Jewish life and activity still hanker after that dignity which the synagogue can confer on them. This is why they return to it periodically even at a considerable outlay of funds.

I preached on the first day and Ira on the second. My subject was "The Book of Life." I was not satisfied with my effort, although the people on the whole were rather pleased with it. Ira based his address on the prayer I wrote out for the Shofar service. I liked his sermon better than mine.

The "Supplementary Prayers" which the United Synagogue published were sold out - about 3400 copies. So far I heard nothing but favorable opinions about them.

Dr. Aaron Rosmarin came out with a scathing attack on my book in this month's number of the Jewish Forum.

* * *

Monday, September 17, 1934

At the meeting of the Seminary Faculty last Friday printed slips stating "I swear (affirm) to uphold the Constitution of the U.S. and of the State of N.Y." etc. were passed around for our signatures. Prof. Davidson

expressed deep resentment at being asked to sign such a statement. The rest of us signed it without protest. Adler defended the legitimacy of the demand of the N.Y. Legislature and pointed out that, as members of an institution which is chartered by the State it is our duty to abide by the ruling of the Legislature. I don't know whether Davidson finally signed or not.

I liked DeHaas' review of my book in the IOBB magazine andde Sola Pool's in the Saturday Review of Sept. 15.

I understand that Brill (a free-lance ex-journalist orthodox rabbi) is spreading the rumor that Adler asked Sulzberger of the N.Y. Times not to publish a review of my book. I think he is simply a mischief maker and is spreading a suggestion which he hopes will be acted on.

Abraham Krasne, a successful business man, middle aged, vulgar and bloated by his success, achieved in the twenty-six years which he has been in America, was offended by Ira's and my remarks last Rosh Hashanah anent employer-employee relations and has threatened to resign.

* * *

Thursday, Sept. 20, 1934

Another annual ordeal - the Yom Kippur appeal and service - is behind me. I have already gotten into the swing of things, at least as far as making Yom Kippur appeals is concerned, and I managed to put this one over too, as the phrase goes. The services began at 7:00. I preached for over an hour and then called for contributions to cover the deficit. The Board of Trustees had not expected me to raise more than $5000 in which case nothing would have been allocated to the Seminary. As it was, $7000 was pledged. Of that amount 1/8 will go to the Seminary.

The services the next day were carried on in satisfactory fashion. The lateness of the hour at which the services ended - 7:10 - made it necessary for me to devise all kinds of schemes to hold the interest of the congregation. Besides the readings from "The Supplementary Prayers" etc.

and other interpolations, I answered a number of written questions which I had asked for on Rosh Hashanah. This took me more than 3/4 of an hour.

In my Yom Kippur Eve sermon when I came to the point that the trouble with the synagogue is that our people treat it as though it were a club, from which they have a right to resign the moment anything in it displeases them, especially if the rabbi happens to say anything which challenges their economic interests. Strange to say, after the sermon, Abraham Krasne (see p.332) pledged $300 in response to my appeal.

* * *

MOTL

Friday, September 21, 1934

I am writing this at 12:00 midnight and am thus violating the Sabbath ordinance against writing. Although I managed to emancipate myself from the habit of conforming to that ordinance a few years ago, yet the old habit has persisted and I have not used the pen on Sabbaths. In consistency with my permitting the playing of piano on the Sabbath I ought frankly to permit writing which satisfies the need for self expression as much as playing an instrument does. But I suppose the feeling that writing is regarded as much more of an infraction of the Sabbath spirit prevents me from being consistent. Even now, as I began writing Selma happened to walk into the study and instead of continuing to write I put away the pen and made believe I was only reading this journal. I am sure she noticed my embarrassment but she acted as though she didn't.

Rabbi Jacob Weinstein called this afternoon. I had asked him to prepare a syllabus on my book for the use of study groups. He had expected to have enough free time during the summer to complete the syllabus, but there was so much work for him to do in the office where he prepares material for use against the nazi propaganda that he was kept occupied the entire summer. He therefore came to tell me that I could go on with my plan to ask Eugene Kohn to prepare the syllabus and he (Weinstein) would put at Kohn's disposal whatever material he has.

Saturday night, September 22, 1934

I like Weinstein very much. He is simple, straightforward and sincere. He had to give up a very large and remunerative position in San Francisco because he insisted upon discussing from the pulpit problems bearing on economic justice. The position he holds now is of a temporary character. He was offered recently two positions where, if he hadn't insisted upon being conscientious he would enjoy security and be well paid; but when he stated that he expected to make the study of the social problems an integral part of his work the offers were withdrawn. One was a position with the Union of Hebrew Congregations as director of youth work. Vogelstein, the president of that organization, said that he regarded Weinstein best qualified for the job, provided he would not touch upon labor problems. Goldenson, the rabbi of Temple Emanuel had a long talk with W. and naturally saw the merit of W's contention, but he is too weak to influence Vogelstein who is in the smelting industry and has had trouble with his employees. The other position was with an established Reform congregation in Chicago, as assistant to Rabbi Hirshberg. Weinstein was called to Chicago for an interview with the president. The latter told him that they built their new temple in 1928 at a cost of $1,750,000 of which they owe $750,000. Hirshberg has become outmoded and they need a young man to put new life into the congregation. Again W. was warned that the discussion of economic issues from the pulpit would alienate important members. If he would consent to lie low for two or three years.

When W. appealed to the president not to mind the possible resignation of a few reactionaries the latter answered, "As far as I am concerned, I am not a Jew and don't believe in religion. I am helping to maintain the congregation for my father's sake. So what the heck -- all I care is to prevent the congregation from breaking up. This is why I am afraid of your type of activity; it might lead to trouble."

* * *

Sunday, September 23, 1934

I got up this morning with a queasy feeling in my stomach and therefore not in the best of humor. But when I looked through the Book Review of the N.Y. Times and did not find the long awaited review of my book I became altogether depressed. The fear that there may be some truth to the above quoted rumor that Adler gave the hint not to have the book reviewed together with a simmering discontent with the literary style of the book contributed to the misery which I felt all morning. I also happened to look into one of the earlier volumes of this Journal and noticed the flatness and colorlessness of its contents, and became so disgusted with myself that I almost made up my mind not to continue with this Journal. To aspire to higher standards of excellence and to be totally impotent to attain them is the most tragic aspect of human life. Heredity and training which play so important a part in life are not a matter of one's choosing. With such antecedents as a Bertrand Russell enjoys is it a wonder that he can write so brilliantly in addition to his being versatile? With an inarticulate ancestry such as mine, with the worst kind of academic training to start me on my professional career, isit a wonder that I have to go through the tortures of the Loocon before I organize my ideas, and the anguish of a deaf mute before I articulate them?

* * *

Tuesday night, September 25, 1934

Feuerbach remarked that "he who fears to be finite fears to exist." In like manner, he who fears to make mistakes fears to do anything. What I say on p. 441 in my book with regard to Kashrut is so phrased that any one who is fari minded can see that I do not give outright lieense to violate kashrut, but that I merely illustrate what I mean by treating it as a folkway instead of as a legal ordinance. The words:" It would not be at all amiss," etc. are evidently not meant to preclude the Gentile going out of his way to provide kosher food for his Jewish friend. But my orthodox colleagues - Rabbis Jung, Wolf, Margolis, Lookstein, Zeitlin and no doubt a few others --

took occasion these days to denounce me as a destroyer of Judaism because of what I say on p. 441. What I can't understand is why they should single me out for attack. If I had claimed to be orthodox there would be some excuse for attacking me. I do not see wherein I am a greater danger to what they consider Judaism than the Reformist and Secularists who have abolished kashrut altogether.

But even if I am mistaken in having raised the issue and even if the suggestion I make is absurd, I do not feel that I ought to worry about it. Far greater thinkers than I am have said things which seem absurd, and yet their reputations have not suffered any. Plato's proposal that women be shared by the men, or Spinoza's suggestion to"make all piety and religion to consist in acts only" or Bertrand Russel's pronouncement that among reasonable and decent people marriage may be expected to "be lifelong, but not that it will exclude other sex-relations."

* * *

Wednesday, September 26, 1934

I have read with a great deal of enjoyment and profit "Personality and Religion" by E. S. Brightman and "The Permanent Horizon" by Ludwig Lewisohn, and am now finding a good deal of stimulation to normal living and clear thinking in Alfred Adler's "What Life Should Mean to You."

What a farrage of nonsense Bertrand Russell's introduction to "Our Changing Morality"! How can a man in his senses make a statement like the following: A man who is perpetually drunk, who kicks his wife when she is pregnant and begets ten imbecile children, is not generally regarded as particularly wicked." These brilliant writers can get away with murder.

* * *

Wednesday, October 3, 1934

Last Monday (p.242) we had a number of visitors. I was in a wise-cracking or truth-telling mood. Louis Finkelstein happened to speak of the services at the Seminary synagogue and to mention the fact that the students always preach from manuscript. I explained to him the abnormal situation in which the students are placed when they try to preach to an audience a few of whom are their teachers and the rest of whom are practically illiterate. Finkelstein then asked "What could be done to bring about a more normal background for the efforts of the students?" To which I replied "A great deal could be done, but the trouble is that we have a great faculty for inhibition."

Mrs. Edward Epstein, though entirely in sympathy with my entire outlook attends services from time to time at the 85 Street synagogue, prompted by loyalty to the congregation which her father had founded and her husband had been affiliated with. When I asked her whether she had been to the SAJ services this Tuesday she replied that she had been at the 85 St. synagogue. "No wonder," I said, "you are loyal to a fault."

Jewish life is between the devil and the deep sea. The devil is Fascism and the deep sea is communism. The Fascists want to destroy the Jews, because it holds them responsible for the spread of radicalism and because they are a convenient scapegoat on which to load all their sins of capitalism. The communists want to create an impassable gulf between the wealthier and the poorer classes of Jews and to destroy Jewish religion because they regard it as a fomenter of reaction.

In the face of this dilemma the position which Jewish life should take is the following: Jewish religion and ethics are prepared to advocate the economic set up of society based on the principle "From each according to his powers to each according to his needs." That is communism. But they are opposed to Marxism with its materialistic interpretation of history and its advocacy of civil war.

This would draw the teeth from Fascism in its attack on the Jews and by bringing up Jewish religion and ethics to the needs of our day it would negate the change of the communists that Jewish life is reactionary.

* * *

Thursday, October 4, 1934

This morning I attended the funeral of my uncle, Jonas Kowarsky, my mother's youngest brother. He was 64, I believe. I first met him when I was brought to Paris in my eighth year where he was engaged with his older brother Joseph in the manufacture of carbonated water. Not long after he followed us to this country where for many years he was engaged in a similar business. He married and raised a family of six sons. After a number of years he invested his savings in second mortgages and retired from business. For a time he lived in comparative comfort, but after a while foreclosures wiped out most of his investments. I haven't visited his home since I have been married. In all I probably haven't met him more than a half-dozen times in all these years, including the two or three weddings of his sons, at which I officiated. He lived the last few years in the Bronx in the Jewish ghetto.

* * *

Friday, October 5, 1934

The funeral was conducted in the semi-barbaric fashion of the ghetto. When I got to the house (1000 Simpson St.) at the time scheduled for the funeral I learned that the body was still being prepared for the coffin. The small rooms were crowded with people, and my uncle's wife was sitting in the bedroom wailing and delivering a monologue in which she gave a detailed account of her husband's business relations and of numerous incidents that she recalled of his life. The women around her joined in the refrain of weeping. When the obsequies were about to begin the oldest son, Milton, asked me to conduct them. I suggested a procedure, but before I had a chance to start the services bedlam let loose. A few women lay prostrate

over the coffin and began screaming and shouting protests against death. The face of the deceased was uncovered and everybody began crowding to take a last look. But once they got near they were rooted to the spot. Finding myself in this human whirlpool, I took the situation in hand, insisted upon drawing the black cloth over the exposed face of the deceased and stopped the procession of morbid gazers. I was surprised at the readiness with which the mob yielded to my demand, and at the quiet which reigned while I read the psalm and spoke. My brother-in-law Phineas, at whose house Jonas was a frequent visitor, due to my mother staying there, delivered a brief eulogy. After that the coffin was taken down stairs but instead of placing it in the hearse it was carried through the street over a distance of about a thousand yards in the course of which a busy thoroughfare had to be crossed on the way to the Hunts Point Talmud Torah Center. I don't suppose such a thing is allowed by the city ordinances, but in such crowded sections the people are left to themselves to do what they like. I understand that some of the neighbors advised strongly against putting the body on ice during the day before the funeral, claiming that it was more appropriate to have the body rest on the floor. A relative suggested that by placing bread and salt near the body the same purpose would be served as putting it on ice.

After the meeting of the Seminary faculty Prof. Davidson said to Prof. Hymmson "I see that you are identified with the Jewish Forum. I must tell you that it is your duty to sever all connection with it for printing such an article as Rosmarin's." Hyamson hemmed and hawed and finally said he would take Davidson's suggestion under advisement. When Hyamson saw that Davidson was rather excited he said, "But you mustn't let your blood pressure rise on account of such things," and then went on to tell some story about his own blood pressure. "But there are certain things I value more than my blood pressure, " Davidson replied.

All this took place in my hearing. I confess to being pleasantly surprised at Davidson's action.

Last night Dr. Henry Simon, a member of the faculty of New College, where Selma is getting her pedagogic training, called. He told me of the difficulty he is experiencing in placing Jewish students. When the New College was organized, Prof. Alexander was warned against admitting too many Jewish students, because of the difficulty in placing them in positions. He poohpoohed the suggestion with the result that 40% of the student body is Jewish. Simon wanted to know whether any of the Jewish Women's organizations might help him solve the problem. I advised him to speak to Adler and to Morris R. Cohen.

* * *

Sunday, October 7, 1934

Things I've learned while preparing the lesson this morning for the TI classes:

1. The tribe of Judah was probably the result of an amalgamation of a Hittite class which had its center at Hebron, together with the nomad Kalebites and Kenizzites. The fact that (p.244) is given the name of a Hittite woman is significant.

2. The monarchy of David was based upon a covenant which implied a limitation to the powers of the king.

3. There were kings (probably Solomon) who exchanged mercenaries to Egypt for horses from there and that this practice is referred to in Deut. 17, 16.

* * *

Monday, October 8, 1934

The rabbi of the Hunts Point Talmud Torah who eulogized my late uncle Jonas Kowarksy at the funeral services said "Mr. Jonas Kowarsky was not of those Jews who believe Judaism is a civilization."

Rabbi Jacob Katz of the bronx phoned last week to ask whether he could come to see me about a review he wanted to write on my book. Since I had to pay the condolence call in his neighborhood last night I went to his

house which happens to be near my late uncle's. In the course of the conversation he quoted the same rabbi (of the Hunts Point TT) I believe, to the effect that I had announced to the worshippers at the SAJ services that they could take taxis to avoid the rain. This happens to be in accord with the facts. Two weeks ago last Saturday it was raining very hard and I was afraid the people would catch cold if they ventured to walk home. Some of them live from half-a-mile to a mile away from the SAJ synagogue. There were very few people at the services, yet the news of my announcement travelled to the Bronx.

* * *

Tuesday, October 9, 1934

Some time ago Benderly came to see me for the purpose of discussing the organization of a group of people who would be willing to formulate a plan for the reconstruction of Jewish communal life in this country. We went over the list of names of those who are to constitute the initial nucleus, and we decided to begin with the addition of one person. We thought of John Slawson, head of the Board of Guardians(?). The three of us met yesterday at lunch in a restaurant on 44 St. I explained to Slawson that I had in mind the formation of a group consisting of laymen and professional workers who took an affirmative attitude of Jewish life. We did not have much trouble in naming some professional men, but when it came to laymen we were stumped. When Slawson mentioned Medalie, I objected on the ground that he probably hasn't made up his mind - if he thought about the question at all - whether to believe in Jewish assimilation or in Jewish survival. We found that to be the case with every layman we could think of. We finally decided on Rothenberg, President of the Zionist Organization and Dr. Israel Wechsler, both of whom I am to speak to. I wonder what Slawson meant by characterizing Rothenberg as narcissistic. In any event this thing is not going to be such easy sledding.

Yesterday I began the course I am giving at the Graduate School for Jewish Social Workers. In discussing the contents of the first chapter in my book, I had a hard time getting some of the students to accept as a fact that the majority of Jews who have been drawn into the stream of modern life add thought regard Judaism as a burden and a liability. Coming after the difficulty Slawson, Benderly and I had in finding a single layman that we could invite to our group this insistence on the part of some of the students that the Jews were just as satisfied with their lot as Jews revealed to me how little we know of what is happening to us.

By this time I am inclined to accept Rabbi Brill's interpretation of the failure of the N.Y. Times to print a review of my book, as due to Cyrus Adler's advice. He seems to have a phobia on the matter of Jewish nationalism. Nadich, a student at the Seminary, told me that when he preached last year at the Seminary on the subject of nationalism, Adler happened to be present. After the sermon Adler told him that the conception of nationalism quoted by him as Renan's was no longer accepted. It was this kind of nationalism that was responsible for Nazism and Fascism.

* * *

Friday, October 12, 1934

Last Wednesday night the formal opening of the Seminary sessions took place. Instead of having those present assemble at the auditorium of the Unterberg Building, they were told to assemble in the social room of the Dormitory Building. After the students, faculty and the few visitors were duly mingled and they interchanged the customary banalities, Adler rose to read from cards what he had to say. It all dealt with the reaffirmation of the principles of Historic Judaism (this is the way A. pronounces the word) as formulated by Sobato Morais and later reiterated by Shechter.

Sunday, October 14, 1934

He made it clear that it was not merely in a spirit of reminiscence that he repeated the story of the founding of the Seminary and of his part in that founding but to make a point. (The point apparently was directed at Kaplan) Then he told the story of R. Gamliel and R. Joshua told in the Mishna. According to that story R. Joshua yielded to the authority of R. Gamliel even though he disagreed with him. I am quite sure Adler gave that entire discourse on a similar occasion once before. At that time too I must have done something to provoke the need for reciting the Seminary Credo.

Having accepted the invitation to speak at the New England Conference of Jewish Communal Agencies scheduled for this week-end I left for Providence Friday at 12:55 and arrived at 5:05. I was met by Rabbi Morris Schussheim who took me to his home. I stayed there over Shabbos. The conversaation at meals, between meals and in the evening when some of the friends he had invited came, turned for the most part upon the difficulties of Jewish life as presented by the congregation, the environment and the conflicting interests of Jewish organizations. There can be no doubt that the congregations contribute to conservation of Jewish life up to a certain point and from there on become responsible for its retardation. They are an obstacle to the development of community. They are rivals of each other and of such community projects as are intended to do Jewish cultural work like community centers. The position of the rabbi in a congregation that has financial difficulties is by no means enviable. He has no time to think or study and is preoccupied with petty details of administrative and picayune fault findings of the members, most all of whom are practically illiterate.

I was disappointed in the small number of the people I addressed last night at Hotel Narraganset. After all the effort I had put into the address and the time spent in coming and going to Providence, I deserved a larger audience. What is worse is the fact that none of the papers seem to

have published the excerpt of the address which had been mailed to them by the SAJ office. In the address I call upon Federation to disavow the policy of assimilation. It seems that such statements strike an unpopular note and are unacceptable to the press, both general and Jewish. Yet they have to be made to reach the Jewish public somehow, if the tide of assimilation is to be stemmed.

* * *

Monday, October 15, 1934

Governor T. F. Green of Rhode Island had been scheduled to greet the delegates to the conference but he did not arrive before I had spoken for about a quarter of an hour. In the course of his remarks he said something about the problem of unemployment which was perfectly imbecilic. He emphasized the leisure aspect of unemployment as offering an opportunity for growth and contemplation. I wonder whether he was led to make that statement by what I had had to say about unemployment breaking a man's spirit. In the latter half of his speech he told an interesting story about the Jews of Providence during the outbreak of the Revolutionary War. When English ships took possession of the harbor and town the Jews, fearing an attack (he didn't say by whom) left the town under the leadership of Aaron Lopez in search of some other place to settle in. In the course of their journey they came to Worcester. They asked for lodging but none of the inhabitants nor any of the hostleries would grant it to them. A great grandfather of Green's who had a large estate on the outskirts of the town, extended to them hospitality and shelter. When the war was over and they could return to Providence they expressed their appreciation by planting two elm trees in front of his house. The stumps of those trees are still there and are exhibited as historic landmarks.

After the meeting I went to the home of the Hasenfeld's where a number of their friends were gathered, among them the Schussheims, Rabbi Olan and his wife who are from Worcester, and Rabbi Braude who is the rabbi

of the Reform Temple in Providence. For two hours I was heckled by Rabbis Braude and Olan. They fought hard for the status quo in Jewish organization. Braude, who originally was something of a Zionist, has finally succumbed to the Cincinnatti philosophy. It was when he said "To me Judaism is a complex of ideas and I feel I have more in common with certain Gentiles than with large masses of Jews, though I would not limit the range of ideas to religion," that I realized the futility of arguing with him. My reply to him was "To me Judaism is a complex of people and to live as a Jew means to accept a special responsibility for those people."

Olan was even more difficult to argue with because he took the attitude that it would be a mistake to try to combine the diverse elements in Jewry. Each group working out its salvation in its own way is to him a perfectly satisfactory arrangement. My reply to him was that each group working by itself is too small to withstand the impact of the environment as is evident from their tendency to dwindle. But it is just these tendencies that men of the Olan type refuse to see.

* * *

Wednesday, October 17, 1934

The American Hebrew of Oct. 12 contains the address delivered by Julian Morgenstern, the president of the Hebrew Union College, at the opening exercises the beginning of this year. However much one may disagree with him one must admit that it is an elaborate dad dignified statement as befits an institution of learning. To compare with it any of Dr. Adler's addresses at the opening exercises of the Seminary is like comparing the address of a confirmant with the address of a mature speaker.

What Morgenstern says about me is highly flattering of my person and highly critical of my views. My vanity is satisfied and my mind is confirmed.

* * *

Thursday, October 25, 1934

I had an unpleasant experience last Tuesday at the Seminary. A student, Buch, delivered his sermon which he had worked out on the basis of an interpretation I had suggested for the following Midrash on (p.248)

After the two men who had outlines based on the same interpretation of the text gave the substance of those outlines, and I made additional suggestion, the student Adler piped up and said that he disagreed with the preacher's interpretation and offered his own. At first I naturally demurred but as I looked at the text and its context I saw that he was right. As soon as the students were in their seats for the following hour I told them that I had been mistaken in my interpretation which I had suggested to the preacher and that Adler was right in his. It was therefore necessary for me to formulate an entirely new proposition and to work out the outline of a new sermon.

Partly responsible for my having gone wrong in that Midrash was the fact that Buch had come to discuss it with me on Sunday at 6:00 after I had been teaching four periods at a stretch. My mind was then too tired to think carefully.

Yesterday I met with Benderly, Slawson, Morris D. Waldman and Glucksman (Executive Director of the Welfare Board) at Trotzky's restaurant, 153 West 35 St. The discussion turned upon the principles by which to be guided in inviting additional people to our group. Waldman made a good point when he said that the purpose of our group should be to develop the ideal of expertness and authoritative direction in the normal aspect of Jewish life to the same degree to which that ideal has come to prevail in bringing under control the abnormal aspect.

The real difficulty is that we have very few people who are sufficiently interested in Jewish survival to make a fight for it, though those who favor the extinction of the Jewish group seem to be mobilizing their forces.

Last summer a prominent Washington Jew by the name of Kaufman called together a number of people that take a leading part in Jewish affairs. Not one among them was an affirmative Jew. Hyman and Lurie of the Jewish Research Bureau, Younker, Willen were among them. This was the information given by Slawson. He also quoted the instance of Lurie's sending a gentile woman to investigate and pass judgment on his (Slawson's) suggeston to federate Jewish employment agencies. That woman had no knowledge of the Jewish aspect of the problem, and, in fact, was negatively predisposed toward the entire proposition.

This morning I called the first meeting of the Editorial Board of the bi-weekly periodical I am planning to issue beginning January. It is to be published by the SAJ. Present were Milton Steinberg, Benjamin Boxer, Eugene Kohn and Ira Eisenstein, besides me. Henry M. Rosenthal was invited but is afraid to join us because of the shakeup which had taken place in the YMHA whose directors oppose any forward or liberal movement. Fisher of Arverne was invited but didn't show up. Robert Gordis had to be coaxed, but will probably cooperate.

My suggestion that it be called "The Reconstructionist" was accepted. The periodical should prove a wholesome and significant influence in Jewish life. Contact with those mentioned above was to me very exhilarating.

* * *

Hebrew

Monday, October 29, 1934

Last night the formal opening of the TI and Seminary College classes took place. This is another one of the ordeals I have to go through annually. My suffering on these occasions is due to my inability to speak Hebrew as fluently as I should be able to do, if I am to trust myself in the presence of all the Hebrew speaking "bears" who constitute the TI Faculty. Having aroused the ire of some of them last year when I spoke in justification of the use of English I was going to speak in Hebrew this time. I went so far as to formulate my thoughts in Hebrew and to conduct the sessions in Religion

also in Hebrew so that I might twist my tongue into shape for a Hebrew speech. But when I rose to speak I was dead tired and lost all confidence in myself and accordingly reverted to English. The students who followed me spoke in Hebrew very fluently and wittily much better than I did in English. Scharfstein gave the principal address. He delivered a regular harangue for more than a half hour, in the course of which he made slurring references to rabbis "who know Hebrew only from the book," and harped upon the importance of conversing in Hebrew. I was even more incensed at his attitude when later in the evening I read his article in the Ha-doar, in which there is a veiled allusion to my attempt to adjust Jewish life to American conditions. He is all for self-withdrawal into a Hebrew ghetto and preparing oneself to settle ultimately in Palestine. This is the philosophy of most of the members of the staff. That exempts them of any obligation to think through the problem of Jewish life as a permanent possibility in this country.

I can't help feeling that theirs is nothing more than a Jewish jingoism which does duty for serious consideration of the problem of Jewish life. Whereas I addressed the students on the need of their being intellectually and morally honest, honest with themselves as a condition to their being honest with others, and on the importance of their reinstating the honor system which has had to be abandoned, Scharfstein swept aside my remarks as if they were beside the point and sailed forth Fascist fashion into the sea of sentimental nationalistic slush. The entire experience sickened and depressed me, and it was by sheer force of will that I have managed to snap out of the mood which it got me into.

* * *

Monday, November 5, 1934

Some time ago F. Temima Nimitzowitz (a graduate of the Teachers Institute and an artist of ability) happened to say to me that she would like to have an opportunity to do some murals for a Jewish public building. A

A few days afterwards at a meeting of the SAJ Board of Trustees the question was discussed whether to put up a bronze tablet in memory of Israel Unterberg similar to the one now affixed to the rear wall of the SAJ synagogue. It then occurred to me that here was our opportunity to avail ourselves of Miss Nimitzowitz's offer by commissioning her to paint some murals for the SAJ. I therefore suggested that in that way the SAJ would be honoring Unterberg's memory far more fittingly than if it put up a bronze plaque. The suggestion did not sink in. In the meantime the Board has had occasion to discuss the matter at two meetings which I was unable to attend. There developed very strong opposition to the idea led by Bernard Semel. Unterberg's son, David, likewise opposed the suggestion. The argument advanced was that Unterberg himself would have objected to anything so elaborate as a mural in his honor. Of course this was merely a rationalization of their conservatism which sensed something unprecedented in the very idea of having murals in a synagogue. Knowing however that I sponsored the idea, they appointed a committee consisting of Harry Liebovitz, Ben Bernstein (Chairman of the Board), David Unterberg, Semel, Ira and myself. The committee met yesterday at 12 at David's home.

Ira had a wedding and Semel had a business appointment at that time and the meeting took place without them, which was a fortunate thing vecause we wasted less time than we otherwise would have. Semel telephoned his vote in the negative. The three who were present sounded as if they too had made up their mind in the negative. I presented my side of the case. Harry Liebovitz was the first to yield. He saw the point I made controverting the argument of simplicity when I gave the analogy of making a contribution in honor of any one to the Hebrew University. The larger the contfibution the more acceptable it would be to the one honored. This in conjunction with the stress I laid on the importance of having the SAJ take the initiative in developing Jewish graphic art in the synagogue made an impresson on Liebovitz and he swung the other two to my side.

Harry Liebovitz is practically the only one by whom the aims I set up for the SAJ are taken seriously, and who would go to great lengths to further them. It was through his support of my other recent suggestion that we resume issuing a periodical and that the undertaking to publish the Reconstructionist is being launched. Seml and Rosenblatt fought also this suggestion.

On Thursday, October 25 Milton Steinberg, Ben Zion Boxer, Eugene Kohn, Ira and I met at my home to discuss the publication of a periodical. We decided to call it "The Reconstructionist" and to use the following motto: "Dedicated to the advancement of Judaism as a civilization, to the upbuilding of Palestine as a Jewish Homeland and to the furtherance of universal freedom, justice and peace." We also decided to organize ourselves into an editorial board which is to meet bi-weekly and discuss the opinions to be expressed in the editorial columns.

I have actually ventured to give the course at the Seminary on the material I worked on during the summer and to use it also for a series of bi-weekly lectures at the SAJ services. I have already given four lectures at the Seminary and two at the SAJ services. As I proceed the objective and its implications become clearer. What began as Soterics and changed into the Art of Living, and then into Applied Ethics and Religion is now (and by now I mean that the idea came to me only this morning) The Art of Ethical Criticism.

* * *

Tuesday, November 6, 1934

We are still improving -- it's now The Principles of Ethical Criticism.

* * *

Wednesday, November 7, 1934

Benderly, Slawson, Waldman, Glucksman and I met today for luncheon at Trotsky's and continued the discussion of the group we are planning to bring together. It became clear that what we want to stress is 1) the need of organizing Jewish life with a view to its permanence and growth, and 2) the need of an affirmative philosophy of Jewish life to make such organization possible. It also became clear that we must first consolidate our position by taking on a number of people in Jewish work who are in sympathy with both of the foregoing aims.

Rev. Dr. Goldenson, formerly of Pittsburgh and now rabbi at Emanuel called on me this afternoon. He came to discuss with me the advisability of organizing a school for adult Jewish study. The need for such a school suggested itself to him when some one brought to him a certain Jewish scholar who had come recently from Germany and who would be available as an instructor in such an institution. When the thought came to him he hadn't yet learned of the formation of the Menorah School which is announced in the recent issue of the Menorah Journal.

There wasn't much to be said on that subject, since we now have to wait and see what that school would accomplish. We agreed, however, that except for one or two courses offered there, it did not come up to what we had in mind. Our idea would be to lay more stress on serious historical study of sources and less on general discussions.

The conversation soon drifted to the demoralized status of the rabbinate at the present time. When I pointed out that such status was the inevitable outcome of the wrong socialogical structure of Jewish life which centered about the synagogue ~~xxxxx~~ group, he refused to look at the matter that way and stuck to the idea that a community is a sum of individuals and if any improvement is to be achieved it could only be through a change of heart on the part of the individuals who constitute the community.

He appeared to me an old, weak, disheartened man. Nevertheless he is worlds superior to a type like Krass who when he was well was a smug complacent go getter whom the moral chaos in Jewish life never seemed to trouble.

* * *

Monday, November 12, 1934

The Jewish problem, the problem of what is to become of the Jews, is driving me insane. In the course of a single day I hear enough and read enough of stupidity, cynicism and perverse opinionatedness about the Jewish question to wish I could go off to some remote corner of the world where I wouldn't hear the name Jew and where I could spend the rest of my years in complete freedom from the need of discussing social problems of whatever nature.

I had lunch today with Benderly, Lowenstein and Willen about the expected Friedsam fund for Jewish education. On the way to the meeting Willen said two things worth noting. 1) that of the twenty-five representative Jews who at the Federation dinner last night sat on the dais at least eighteen were definitely in favor of assimilation, and 2) that though these Federation leaders have never made any secret of their assimilationist proclivities, a number of Jewish social workers and educators proceed from the assumption that the Federation should aim at the conservation of Jewish life.

There was enough in these statements to make me feel glum by the time I sat down to lunch. We did not proceed far in the discussion of what we came together for when I was irritated by another remark of Willens. Referring to Judge Roseman who is to be the chairman of the committee in charge of the fund, Willen quoted him as saying that he would accept the chairmanship only on one condition, viz: that we have on the committee experts in education that have never had any connection with Jewish education. He would, e.g. insist on having Dr. Kandell. At this I flared up. "Kandell happens to be the right kind of a person" I said, "because he has at least Jewish sympathies

but I certainly would object to a man like Paul Klapper of City College. I can't see why having been dissociated from Jewish life should constitute a special qualification for being an authority on Jewish education."

In fact I was already in a bad mood last night after I read over Michaelson's critique of the course I had thus far given in Homiletics. It was so negative and disagreeable in spirit that I could not help being exasperated by it. It did not evince the least attempt to try to understand what I was trying to set forth, but proceeded in a hair splitting, petti-fogging and disputatious fashion to demolish every statement I had made. It is true that I did not altogether make plain to the men why I was giving this course in ethical criticism. But should not the men - who are no longer youngsters - have sensed that once we find it impossible to preach and teach in an authoritarian spirit we must have some integrated philosophy to take the place of the authoritarian tradition? And that this was what I was trying to explain to them? But, no. Not having been told this in so many words, they pounced upon the classification of values into different levels and standpoints and tried to tear it to pieces as though they were vultures and the scheme of classification something for them to try their claws and beaks on. Should men who prepare themselves for a spiritual call-ing have this ravenous appetite to tear and maul? If I were a goy and they were students in a class of mine at a university they would easily make an anti-Semite of me and I would insist upon limiting the Jewish quota.

It is this same smartness and destructive attitude on the part of Jewish students that is responsible for a Jewish hospital like Mt. Sinai refusing to take Jewish nurses.

We are, indeed, an unfortunate people.

To cap it all, when I came home I looked through the English section of the Jewish Day published a week ago yesterday in celebration of the twen-tieth anniversary of the first appearance of that paper. There I came across Adler's article in which he discharges a broadside at my book, a broadside

xx of muddy ideas and slush phrases. "We ought to cast out...the so-called ideologies - a word that I have come to loathe...now why should Jewish writers whine and blame the present difficulties of the Jews upon emancipation? Because this inevitably leads to the only solution, the return to Palestine...But anyone must know that this cannot be the solution of the Jewish question."

While these fulminations of Adler irritated me, the contents of the rest of the English section almost broke my heart. The babel of tongues -- Jewish and Gentile -- each one proffering advice that is the very antithesis of what the next one has to say at first made me dizzy and then completely unnerved me. O God! Is this the madness with which you are afflicting us in preparation of the destruction you are about to wreak upon us?

The assimilationist Jews create in the mind of the average person the illusion that they are interested in the maintenance of Jewish life because they are apparently serious in their fight against anti-Semitism and are prepared to make considerable sacrifices in time and money to stem its progress. The truth, however, is that they are fighting anti-Semitism because it doesn't permit them to become Goyim, whereas those of us who are not assimilationists are fighting it because it doesn't let us live as Jews.

* * *

Thursday, November 15, 1934

I devoted a considerable part of the lecture at the Seminary on Tuesday to an explanation of the purpose of the course I was giving there on the principles of ethical criticism. I pointed out to them that if they did not want to function like the sandwich men by advertising ideas and platitudes which were not completely integrated into their very being, they ought to realize that they really have nothing authoritative to fall back upon. Since they no longer accept the Torah as possessing supernatural character, they are compelled to base their teachings upon some rational conception of

ethics and religion. It is such a conception that I am attempting to formulate for them.

I think the students felt they were beginning to understand what I was driving at.

Tuesday night I spoke at the Jewish Community Center in Troy, N.Y. When I arrived at Albany at 7:09. I was met at the station by Rabbi Joel S. Geffen who took me to his home where I had dinner with him and his wife. During the six mile trip from the station Geffen managed to give me a bird's eye view of the community and of the place of his congregation in it. The Jewish community numbers about 3000 souls. His congregation consists of about 150 families. It is conservative and has among its members the most influential Jews. Most of them are children of Lithuanian Jews who had rather worse than the average amount of Jewish knowledge possessed by our laymen. They had an orthodox congregation which was headed by an old time rabbi who was somewhat liberal in his attitude toward differences of opinion though he did not deviate in the least from the traditional practices. Due to that type of background many of Geffen's leading congregants are easy to work with and fall in easily with his "conservative" type of Judaism.

The audience I addressed was of the usual sub-normal kind. I had to speak in the most elementary terms possible to hold their attention, in which I succeeded.

The chairman in introducing me said that he had been told about my book that it was the greatest work of the kind since Spinoza's Guide to the Perplexed.

* * *

Sunday, November 25, 1934

Last Wednesday I took part in the formal opening of the classes for women recently organized by Chipkin for the Israel Friedlaender classes in cooperation with Hadassah, Ivriah and the Women's League of the United Synagogue.

Although it rained there was not a vacant seat in the auditorium which seats about 300 people. The women's organizations were represented on the program by their presidents and in addition to Chipkin, Finkelstein and Shalom Spiegel I spoke. Finkelstein made the point that in these troublous times we should each seek our own individual salvation. Spiegel dwelt on the self-hate of the ignorant Jewess as illustrated by the selection from the diary quoted in Theo Lessings little book on "Judische Selbot Hass." Although I had prepared my remarks I somehow experienced difficulty in uttering them. The words did not come readily and as a consequence my delivery was stilted. The usual after effects of such an experience followed. I was just too wretched for words. (Probably that's why they failed me when I needed them.)

The next experience from which I came forth far less scathed, nevertheless was not calculated to put me in a very happy frame of mind. On Thursday night I went to the Community House of Temple Emanuel eager to speak before the Men's Club. I was dressed in tuck and arrived on the dot at 8:30. Instead of an audience I found a few stragglers standing outside and in the lobby. I was taken into a side room where I was "entertained" by a crazy female who was introduced to me as the daughter of Mr. Goldsmith the president of the Men's Club. Later the assistant Rabbi Glazer arrived. I endured boredom for about half an hour. I begged them to start. When I came on the platform I saw at once that I was not to address the Men's Club but a motley crowd who had gathered in answer to announcements in the press.

When I got up to speak I gave vent to my feelings by remarking that I was looking in vain for the men of the Men's Club and I added: It was very gracious of the Men's Club to open this meeting to the public to provide the speaker with an audience.

It took me some time to warm up to what I was supposed to talk on, Judaism as a Civilization. But after a while I managed to speak rather enthusiastically and fluently.

* * *

Thursday, November 29, 1934

A bookseller by the name of Shenkman cajoled me today into buying Almaliah's Hebrew Arab dictionary and J. D. Eisenstein's Memoirs. I spent a few hours reading sections from the latter, because they brought back many childhood memories, especially those which centered on my father's connection with the chief rabbi Jacob Joseph.

* * *

Friday, November 30,1934

Last night Sidney Musher asked Hadassah to marry him. May God bless them. Lena and I are happy beyond words. I spent with my family (including Ira and Judith and Sidney and Hadassah) an enjoyable and serene evening last night after a hearty Thanksgiving dinner. Sidney had not yet proposed, but everything pointed that way. During the night (about 2:30) Hadassah walked into our bedroom and told us the good news.

* * *

Thursday, December 6, 1934

Not even the happiness I derive from Hadassah and Sidney could prevent my yielding to a feeling of depression when I noted last Tuesday the lack of response on the part of the Seminary students to my efforts to interest them inthe fundamental problem of personality.

I managed to overcome that feeling as a result of the talk I gave last night at the Community Center of Congr. B'nai Jeshurun which is celebrating this week its 110th anniversary. When some time ago Israel Goldstein invited me to be one of the speakers at a symposium on character training I declined. He called me up and urged me to withdraw my refusal, adding that he cannot understand why I do not manifest the spirit of cooperation which as a Seminary graduate he has a right to expect of me. I then told him that I was the one to find fault with him for his refusal to cooperate with me, and I cited

as an instance my effort to get him to support me in my endeavor to merge his religious school and that of the SAJ. Of course I did not expect to receive a satisfactory reply, but I felt that I ought not to persist in my refusal to participate in the symposium. I even suggested to him how to organize it, taking for myself the subject "The Place of Tradition in Chracter Training." The other two speakers were Prof. Adelaide Case of Teachers College and Jacob Greenberg, the recently elected associate superintendent of education in N.Y. City.

I was pleasantly surprised at the size of the audience and its responsive attitude to the subject matter. After the experience with the Temple Emanuel Men's Club two weeks ago this one was a joy and put me into a happy frame of mind. It showed in the delivery for although I read most of what I had to say from notes, it was well received.

See MMK BK / Zifel Kohn

I asked Eugene Kohn who is helping me with the work on "The Religious Outlook of the Modern Jew" to formulate the acknowledgment which he thought I ought to make in referring to his assistance. He did not write out the formula but stated it to me today orally. We agreed that it read as follows: "I feel indebted to Rabbi Eugene Kohn who helped me to elaborate some of the ideas in the book, thereby facilitating its earlier appearance than would have been possible under the pressure of my routine duties."

* * *

Friday, December 7, 1934

I happened to come across in the first volume of this journal the item about my having been one of the speakers during the war at a YMHA rally to encourage the young men to enlist in the army. I felt deeply ashamed of myself. Shouldn't that experience teach me that I need to be wary of the tendency to opportunism? Or shall I be more charitable with myself and say "the tendency to self-delusion"?

That I have undergone a social re-education is quite apparent from this Journal. But that I have yet a good deal to learn before I shall know the whole truth and have the courage to proclaim it is equally evident.

Take, for example, the recent summary execution in Russia of about two hundred people without having given the accused even a chance to defend themselves helps the opportunist in me to go on mouthing the platitudes about non-violence. Yet in my heart I know that the dominant regime in this country is daily smothering the lives of thousands of people or condemns them to a slow physical and spiritual death. O God, if I only knew what I could do to identify myself with the future of human society rather than with its past or status quo.

* * *

Sunday, December 9, 1934

Last night the SAJ gave a dinner in honor of Harry Liebovitz in recognition of his generosity and service. The affair was very satisfactory from every standpoint and for once I was in real good form. The address I gave went over with a bang.

* * *

Tuesday, December 25, 1934

On Sunday, December 16 I prefaced my lecture to the Junior Class of the Institute with an apology for having gotten into a temper the Sunday preceding when I found that the students hadn't brought their Bibles with them to class.

On Wednesday, December 19 I took part in the luncheon meeting at Trotsky's of the - shall I call it the What's What Group? Present were, besides myself, Benderly, Lowenstein (Exec. Director of Federation) Slawson, Spiegel, Coralnik and Kohs. Absent were Glucksman, Waldman, Baron and Steinberg. We are still groping.

Last Friday I started the tedious process of collecting funds for the Reconstructionist. My first prospect was Thau. I called him up and asked him whether I could come and have lunch with him. He preferred to come to see me instead. He kept his word and came to see me Sunday morning and promised to contribute as much as I would ask him. Today I went to Sam Lamport's home and had breakfast with him. He promised to contribute $100. My purpose is to raise $3500. Harry Liebovitz of his own accord has already pledged $700.

A young daughter of Mrs. Harris (an SAJ member) is dangerously ill with the sleeping sickness. The mother had some one ask me to have prayers said for her child. What could I do but grant her request.

This evening I saw a communist play "The Sailors of Cattaro" presented at the Civic Repertory. Such plays put the whole of my work out of focus and it requires considerable mental strain to get it into focus again.

As I listened this morning to Lasker's (student) sermon on the need of fostering religion in Palestine (he read the sermon to me at my home) I was moved to determine that I take a sabbatical leave next year and go to Jerusalem for the purpose of organizing a modern spiritual service with a congregation to which none who exploit the labor of others should be admitted.

I was deeply ~~xxxxx~~ stirred by Hugo Bergman's three articles in Magnayim in which he summarizes the philosophy of Martin Heidger.

MAZNAYIM:

* * *

Kierkegaard

Thursday, January 10, 1935

Last Sunday I spoke at the Welfare Conference which took place under the auspices of the Council of Federations and Welfare Funds at the Community House of Temple Emanuel. Last Monday night my Hadassah was married to Sidney Musher. The wedding took place at my house. I officiated with my brother-in-law Phineas Israeli and my son-in-law, Ira Eisenstein assisting.

* * *

Sunday, January 13, 1935

I have found it rather hard, of late, to describe in detail the goings on within and about me. The main reason for this difficulty I believe is my preoccupation with the search for material for the course I am giving at the Seminary, the course on what I would designate as "The World as it Ought to Be." I depend upon that material also for the series of addresses I am giving at the SAJ services on alternate Sabbath mornings. So far I have given six of those addresses. The last one on "Why Humanism Is Not Enough" was so good that I shall have to work mighty hard to equal it. From now on I am afraid it will not be such easy sailing. I have to work up altogether new material, from the point of view of personality as an ethical criterion.

In addition to the foregoing task I have been kept busy with preparing papers for public functions and spending considerable time discussing the Reconstructionist. The bulk of the work and responsibility of publishing that periodical will apparently devolve upon Ira and me. When I started this year's activities I had made up my mind not to allow myself to be drawn into desultory speaking and writing, and to confine myself to some large scale literary effort. But I am too weak to resist the opportunity of hammering away at the need of giving meaning and direction to Jewish life. The dissolution is proceeding with terrifying rapidity, yet having committed myself to the

task of putting a halt to it, by publishing my book I can't go on pleading with our people on every possible occasion to c me to their senses. It is for that reason I could not persist in my refusal to speak under the auspices of the Council of Federations and Welfare Funds, both at Providence in November and in this city last Sunday.

My fears that the organization which invited me to address the meetings was antagonistic to everything I represented and that the very discussion of the basic issues of Jewish life was introduced merely as a sop to the public, were borne out by what Ira M. Younker, one of its main workers, said to me just before I was to go up to the platform. He told me that those who financed the Council (I presume Warburg et al) especially Proskauer objected to the part of the program dealing with the general questions of Jewish adjustment and Zionism. Likewise the chairman of the afternoon session in which I took part, Judge Joseph E. Ullman of Baltimore, in introducing the first speaker, Mr. Schlossberg, pointed out that the matters to be discussed were merely a side-issue and were not intended to lead to any practical results or passing of resolutions. I was not going to allow such remarks to pass unchallenged. Before beginning my address I asked him whether he really meant his remarks to be taken seriously. I had to put that question to him, because in my address which I had written out, I referred very specifically to the possibility of being cynical about the entire discussion and regarding it as by-play. Judge Ullman told me he had only been joking. I mentioned this when I came to that sentence in my address, in which I referred to rhe very attitude he had actually expressed in his introductory remarks. I added that if I had known that I was merely to entertain the listeners, I would have used my time in the library to better advantage.

The majority of the audience were sympathetic toward my point of view -- many of them having been my friends and former students -- greeted me with loud applause when I rose to speak, punctuated my address with applause, especially when I took the chairman to task for his indiscretion, and gave me quite an ovation when I was through.

I was followed by Prof. Morris R. Cohen. He deprecated the organization of communal life on a permanent basis. His main objection against it was that it would destroy the freedom of Jews to do as they pleased and would bring back the ghetto as pictured by "Mendele Moher S'forim."

There were questions from the floor, for the most part addressed to Cohen by those who agreed with me. But the questions were put in such a way as to give him the better of the argument. It was only at the very end that a question was put to me in such a way as to enable me to show the sophistry of his position. He didn't like the idea of being refuted. He was white with anger when he said to me after the meeting broke up "I am an assimilationist. I am sorry I wasted time in my youth on the study of Talmud. If I had used that time for the study of science or law, I would have been better off."

Last night the so-far anonymous group met at my house. Present were Benderly, Prof. Salo Baron, Prof. Shalom Spiegel, Dr. Coralnik, Dr. Slawson, Glucksman (of the Welfare Board), Dr. Karpf and Dr. de Sola Pool. Absent were Lowenstein, Waldman, Steinberg, Bladeck and Kohs.

The discussion was informal beginning with remarks about the session last Sunday at which Cohen and I spoke. It organized itself after a while. We arrived at the following decisions: 1. That we discuss the effort of the Welfare Board to organize the Jews of Jersey City (about 20000) into some kind of integrated community. 2. That

we analyze the status of the rabbinate and its training from the standpoint of communal life. 3. That we do likewise with the social workers. 4. That if the foregoing discussions prove fruitful we have in mind the organization of a public symposium at which our views would be expounded. The outcome of that symposium should be a publication in book form and if possible also in magazine form.

Karpf acted rather disagreeably when it was suggested that he should give an analysis of the problem of training Jewish social workers. He implied that there are so many facts about it that he would not like to bring into the open.

I understand that Harry Lurie, in summing up the discussion of last Sunday afternoon, said that I represented the neo-Orthodox traditional Jewish Catholic point of view, and that Cohen expressed the enlightenedd and liberal point of view.

* * *

Sunday, January 20, 1935

Last Tuesday morning I arrived at Pittsburgh for the speaking engagement under the auspices of the YM & YWHA which had been arranged through the Jewish Welfare Board.

As soon as I got to the Hotel (The Webster Hall) I telephoned to H. Passamaneck the director of the Y to find out whether the organization meeting of the women of the YM & YWHA at which it had been understood that I was to speak was till on. It had been scheduled for Tuesday afternoon, and although I had written asking for information as to its purpose so that I might know what to talk about, I hadn't received word from a certain Mrs. Davis, the chairman of the meeting. Passamaneck informed me that the meeting would take place and that I was expected to address it. This meant that I had to start at once thinking what to say to the women.

Taking as my cue the idea that in order to qualify for social service (which the women were engaged in through Hadassah and the Council for Jewish Women) they ought to keep on growing intellectually and spiritually. I made the point that they ought to utilize the community center as a means to such growth. This it can become by providing 1) fellowship that is intellectually and spiritually stimulating and 2) opportunities for the intelligent use of leisure. I advised the organization of activities centering about the Sabbaths and Festivals, the institution of artistic evenings, permanent exhibits, parent study groups, etc.

At 10:30 H. Passamaneck came with Rabbi Hailperin to my room at the hotel. We discussed mainly how to conduct the three day Institute. I had lunch with Passamaneck at the hotel. The women's meeting took place at the Y about 3:30. It was in the nature of an afternoon tea. Mrs. Davis and a Mrs. Reizenstein spoke before I did. Both of them gave a general idea of the plan they had in mind. I noted that the word Jew or Jewish was not mentioned until Mrs. Davis started introducing me. The change in the content and manner of her address was so abrupt that it sounded like a chance from ordinary conversation to preaching.

There were about 100 women in the audience and three men. The latter were Rabbis Hailperin and Benj. Lichter and Mr. Passamaneck. I somehow found it difficult to get into the swing of speaking and at one time I hesitated almost three seconds in search of the proper word --commercialize -- and had to fall back on a poorly improvized word -- mercantilized -- which I had had a hard time in pronouncing in the first place. But having begun with a well turned remark about my having to lay a three day siege to Pittsburgh, unlike the itinerant lecturers who came, spoke and conquered, and having warmed up toward the latter part of my talk, I could go on with my preparations for the talk I was to give in the evening without any disturbing regrets.

Tuesday night I spoke on "Judaism as a Civilization," Wednesday night on "The Evolution of the Jewish Religion" and Thursday night on "The Organization of Jewish Life in America." I had large audiences amounting to several hundred on each of the three nights. The second night the audience was somewhat smaller due, I believe, to the sleet and rain which made driving quite difficult. I spake between an hour and an hour and a half each time and held the attention of the people from beginning to end. I don't think more than two or three people walked out in all the three lectures. After each lecture I answered questions which had been written out on slips of paper provided and later collected by ushers. There were so many questions that most of them had to go unanswered.

I put in considerable effort into the preparation of each talk and a good deal of energy into the delivery. It was the opinion of every one present that the Institute proved a success and far exceeded their expectations. I was interested in noting the effect of my talks on a young man by the name of Wasser who seems to be closely identified with the Y. He is a lwayer of rather unusual intelligence. In the discussions I had with him I could see that he was fighting against having to bring his Jewishness to light instead of forgetting about it. What seemed to have won him was the second talk I gave. This was not the first time I had occasion to be convinced that if the history of the Jewish religion were presented to young people in realistic evolutionary fashion they would not find being a Jew so irksome.

Two other people in the audience deserve mention. One is a certain (p.263) (this is the way he signed his name to the question he had sent up). He was among the founders of Young Israel and he remembered having called on me some twenty-five years ago to take a leading part in that movement. I met him again several years ago when I spake in Lichter's synagogue. There he rose to heckle me because of

religious radicalism. Now as then I found him to be wholehearted in his simple faith and unquestioning piety objecting strenuously to my denial of revelation, etc. I asked him what he did for a living. He told me he kept a small grocery store and that nothing in the world would induce him to keep it open on the Sabbath. During the war he never ate any ritually forbidden food during the entire year that he was in the army. But what I would like to know what makes aman who is so orthodox come to hear me every time he can. I could see that he was kindly disposed toward me that it hurt him to hear me say some of the things I did.

The other person is Abrams, the principal of the Hebrew Institute in Pittsburgh. From general accounts that Institute is supposed to be doing good work though I must confess I am inclined to be sceptical. The students that came to the Seminary from that Institution were rather scraggy and most of them failed to go through. In my first lecture I emphasized the fact that in the Hebrew and religious schools the teachers are not honest with their pupils when they teach them Bible and Jewish history. This must have piqued my friend Isaacs (who for some reason unknown to me calls himself professor). After the second lecture which I would account as one of the best I ever gave, he said to someone that after all I didn't answer the question what we Jews should believe. From Mrs. Hailperin I heard that his wife said to her that she had her sixteen year old son with her when I gave the second lecture for which she is very sorry because he heard things from me which he shouldn't have heard.

I had dinner with the Hailperins Wednesday night before the lecture. He is the rabbi of the Congregation Tree of Life. One of his staunch supporters and admirers is Harry Dobrin, the brother of a classmate of mine at the Seminary during the first years of its reorganization under Schechter. From him I learned that although the congregation had suffered considerably during the last few years, it is almost on its feet again, and that Hailperin is well liked. From the little that I saw of the work he did for the doctorate, I infer that he must have learned quite a little of the kind of thing that passes for scholarship. In addition, he said more than once in my hearing that as a student of the Seminary he had not had enough of a general training to appreciate what I was trying to teach. It is only of late that he has begun to think.

Whatever I may think of Hailperin as a Jewish teacher and thinker, I must admire him for the heroic fashion in which he meets the many troubles in his life without the least complaint. The first thing I learned as I came to his house was that his little boy of nine has to be given insulin regularly to fight off diabetes. Then I learned of his wife's sister who lives with them. She has been the viction for the last twelve years of the sleeping sickness. In addition there was his mother-in-law, Mrs. Silverman, whose husband had been killed in an automobile four months ago. She and another unmarried daughter were staying with the Hailperins. By a strange coincidence H's own father was also killed a number of years ago in the same manner. His father had been on the way to synagogue and his father-in-law on the way from synagogue. In spite of all these upsetting factors in the lives of the Hailperins they are neither grouchy nor self-centered. They are active and interested in everything that goes on and seem to get considerable joy out of life. Their newly born baby affords them a great deal of happiness. For all this I admire them and wish I could learn from them at least not to be upset by the most trivial mishaps and not to be worried about the future.

Thursday morning as I was taking a walk I was overtaken by Mr. Dobrin. He accompanied me on my walk. He told me a few things of interest about Rabbi Goldenson who is now in Emanuel and his successor Rabbi Freehoff. Goldenson did very little to strengthen the Jewish consciousness of his members. He spoke very seldom on topics of Jewish interest and on the whole associated very little with Jews outside those affiliated with his congregation. His one great hobby was to fight against the "iron police" of the steel corporations. He tried to get laws passed against privately hired police forces and in other ways made that the target of his attack. When Freehoff came the impression at once went forth that he would pursue a more Jewish policy than his predecessor. This impression was based upon two reforms which Freehoff introduced, one was to have the Ten Commandments engraved over the Ark and the other was to have the Torah taken out from the Ark with greater ceremony. The people instead of remaining seated are asked to rise when the Ark is opened, and the two main officers of the congregation walk up and stand alongside the rabbi as the scroll is taken out. The interest Freehoff has shown in the Zionist organization of the city and otherevidences of a tendency to associate with Jews outside his own congregation have confirmed the impression that he is more of a Jew than Goldenson.

When Dobrin and I got back to Dobrin's car I asked him to take me to Rabbi Goodman Rose who, on account of his illness, was prevented from coming to see me and attending the lectures I gave. He too informed me at once with a good deal of joy that he was continuing his self-education. Unlike Hailperin who had gone in for research, Rose was studying Mishan and Gemara. The presence of enough old men in his congregation who derive religious satisfaction from the routine study of those subjects has stimulated Rose to conduct study groups necessitating his becoming versed in the reading of Talmud and commentaries. He even added that he has made progress in the ability to converse in Hebrew. "I put my shame in my pocket," he said, "and asked some of the teachers in my Hebrew School to correct me every time I

made a mistake in the Hebrew I spoke to them. That was the only way I could acquire the necessary practice."

It is really pathetic how anxious most of our Seminary graduates are to improve their knowledge of Jewish subject matter and how they rejoice when they find the kind of environment that is an incentive to their growth. But unfortunately they seldom find such an environment and what they have to do is like trying to lift themselves by their bootstraps.

The conversation then turned upon a "Shailah" (ritual question) that Rose said had come to him as the outcome of a struggle that was going on between the Montefiore Hospital and the Orthodox rabbis of whom there are six or seven. These rabbis have published a protest against the Hospital declaring it to be "trepha," and refusing to recognize its attempt to introduce "kashrut" unless it engaged the services of a supervisor at a cost of $1200 a year to the hospital. The trustees of the hospital who are typical German Jewish assimilators have refused to yield to the request of the Orthodox rabbis, because of the expense involved. Rose, Hailperin and Lichter, fearing that the hospital would give up entirely its attempt to have kasher food, offered their services gratis on condition that a Jewish cook be put in charge of the preparation of the food. Their offer has been accepted, and they divide among themselves the task of visiting and supervising the culinary department of the hospital. The "shailah" which occasioned all this explanation was whether it was permitted to boil dishes used by a pneumonia patient together with trepha dishes for the purposes of sterilization. This "shailah" had been telephoned to Rose a little while before I came.

Further discussion of the local Federation brought out the fact that if there were only a few sincere leaders among the east-European Jews in each community the German-Jewish assimilationists would be readily won over to more Jewish policies in the conduct of their social service institutions. The trouble is that whenever any one of a more aggressive type among the east European element ~~xxxx~~ asserts himself, he does it only either to fawn

on the assimilators or to antagonize them and in either case to exploit the situation for his own advantage. In Pittsburgh, e.g., there is a Dr. Weinberg, a successful neurologist. He comes from the Jewish radical socialist group and poses as their defender against the usurpation of the German Jews. At the same time he managed in the early years of the Montefiore Hospital to become the chief of staff. That was his reward for the assistance he had rendered in collecting funds for the hospital. But once in that position, he was ruthless and arbitrary and made himself impossible. Now that he is out he does everything he can to sabotage its work. Although as chief of staff he appointed a majority of gentile physicians, he now attacks the board of the hospital on the ground that it is anti-Semitic. Nor was it difficult for him to substantiate his charge, because he went to one of the employment agencies and there unearthed a card listing a minor position vacant at the hospital and marked "Don't send a Jew" or something like that. Although he has always been identified with the radical element, he is now lending his support to the Orthodox rabbis who are boycotting the hospital because it refuses to engage a supervisor over the kashrut.

From Rose's home Dobrin drove me to the hotel. On the way he showed me Rose's synagogue. It was built only about three or four years ago. In answer to my question whether the congregation had a large mortgage on the synagogue he told me that thereby hangs an ugly tale. The mortgage amounted to $100,000. When the banks not long ago had to close and in order to reopen were forced to make arrangements reducing their indebtedness, the trustees of Rose's congregation succeeded in reducing the mortgage to $20,000. This sharp practice, unfortunately typical in Jewish institutions, left behind it in this instance a deep resentment among the depositors of the banks affected against Jews. Rose apparently made no move to prevent this kind of dirty deal. In all likelihood he is so unaware of the implications of that kind of practice that it did not even occur to him to object.

This unethical attitude is quite common among our people. I suppose they are no worse than anybody else but that doesn't make their wrongs any less pardonable. It seems that on the whole the more Orthodox the institution is the more it is given to such practices. Many of the people who worked on the synagogue building haven't been paid to this day. And it is not at all uncommon for these people to be taken advantage of when they are hard pressed for money, and to have their claim settled for about 20%.

When it comes to making money for the synagogue these ruthlessly orthodox congregations have no scruples about transgressing even ritual law (which from their standpoint is even more important than ethical principle). Dobrin told me that Rose's congregation dealt in cemetery plots. The committee in charge of the cemetery does not hesitate to compel an impoverished widow to pawn her few belongings in order to pay the price of a grave and then to collect from some burial fund for the difference between what they were paid by the widow and what they can further extort from others for a similar grave. That committee had made it a practice to take out prospective customers to the cemetery on the Sabbath. It was only after Hailperin had sent in a protest that that practice was abandoned.

Last night was supposed to be seminar night, but for some reason most of the students failed to come. The only ones that showed up were Nadich and Zimmerman. Nadich had been assigned the subject of "nationalism in its relation to personality." I asked him how he was getting on with his work on the subject of nationalism. He told me that he was contemplating to make a study of the status of the Jews in France. This led me to go off on a disquisition about the folly of doing research work with a view of getting the doctorate instead of using that time to become generally informed on those large problems which are crying out for a solution at the present time. I pointed out the fatal mistake that was being made by the seminaries in confusing the training for social engineering with training for being an

antiquarian or archaeologist. We certainly need archaeologists, but their entire approach and procedure are not likely to help a man in dealing with problems which it is the function of the rabbi to cope with. A student preparing to be a civil engineer should not spend most of his time in research on the contribution of Archimedes to physics, nor should a student of medicine center his interest upon the status of medicine in the days of Hippocrates. I advised Nadich to sacrifice the chances of getting his Ph. D. and to devote himself to a comprehensive study of nationalism with a view of arriving at a clearer understanding of what should be the status of Jews in the modern world.

* * *

Tuesday, January 22, 1935

The following illustrates the topsy-turvy condition of Jewish life: Lewis L. Strauss who is connected with Kuhn, Loeb and Co. is a member of the Seminary Board of Directors. He has a child whom he wants to teach the Bible stories. Not satisfied with any of the published books dealing with those stories he undertook to write them out himself. He was afraid, however, that the English might not be of the best; so heasked the Seminary to send him a student who would revise the text which he had written out. The Seminary sent him Morris Adler, one of the members of this year's graduating class, and this is what Strauss said to Adler: "I object to the usual way in which the Bible stories are told to children for two reasons; first, the tendency to talk down to the children; secondly the miracles are either underemphasized or denied altogether. I remember when I was a child of ten in my home town in Virginia, the rabbi who taught me Bible told me that all the stories of miracles were merely legends. When I heard that I ran out of the room. The man who said that was none other than Morgenstern, the present head of the Hebrew Union College. After many years Morgenstern asked me to contribute to the College. But I thought here was a chance to have my sweet revenge on him and I took advantage of the opportunity by refusing to contribute.

Only recently when they were looking for some one to succeed Vogelstein as head of the Union of Hebrew Congregations, they asked me to accept the presidency. Again the desire to repay Morgenstern for daring to tell me that the miracle stories were legends asserted itself and I refused the offer."

This same Struass was mentioned recently in one of John Spivak's articles in the Masses as having financed some Fascist group which was at the same time engaged in spreading anti-Semitic propaganda.

Sylvia Rubin came to see me today to ask me to find or formulate some appropriate text or inscription on the bronze plaque which is attached to the headstone over her father's grave. After I had agreed to comply with her request her sister Doris walked in. She had come from Dr. Pool who detained her with a long explanation in answer to her question "Why not cremate the body?" She was told of my undertaking to supply the epitaph. She then said that she had also asked Dr. Pool to submit an epitaph, and that the family would then decide which to accept. "This is the way," she added "father always acted in matters of that kind." I emphatically refused to submit to that kind of contest and withdrew my acceptance. I made her realize in rather strong language that her suggestion was in very poor taste and told her that I would be perfectly satisfied to have Pool attend to the matter, since the grave was in the Spanish-Portuguese Cemetery and his congregation with its idiosyncracies insisted upon having its own way in the conduct of all affairs pertaining to its cemetery.

In the course of the conversation she said her father was more ashkenazic than sephardic. O ye gods! Human vanity doesn't stop even at the grave.

* * *

Tuesday, January 29, 1935

How little the Seminary authorities have any idea of the religious unrest among the very men who are studying for the rabbinate! Could they imagine for a moment that in a class at the Seminary there could go on the kind of discussion that went on during the hour in Homiletics this afternoon. In discussing the outline I had given them on "Humanism is not enough" I was bombarded with questions as to why I insist upon retaining the name of God in the ethical pattern of thought. The usual arguments about the misconceptions in the minds of those who hear it used were advanced with a great deal of clarity and force by the best men in the class.

In answer to the argument that by using the term God I've only reenforced the anthropomorphic conception in people's minds, I made the point that what I am urging is not merely that the name God be retained, but that we center all our efforts upon educating the people to put new content into that name. That is at present our main function as religious teachers.

In answer to the argument that some of the most worthwhile people are alienated from Jewish life and ethical endeavor along Jewish lines because we insist upon using the name of God I replied, first, they are alienated because we do not engage frankly in the task of putting new content into the term God, and seconldy it is not the use of the term God that repels them but rather the whole nexus of legends which most of our people insist upon teaching as factual and historical.

In answer to the argument that it is impossible to retain our prayerbook if we are to use the term God in the sense in which I suggested, I said that I hold no brief for the prayerbook. Why not write new prayers in conformity with the modern conception of God? Why have a prayerbook at all? Why not prayers which can be used at discretion and in accordance with actually felt needs?

* * *

Saturday night, February 2, 1935

Last Wednesday I left for Providence to deliver the address I had been scheduled to give before the Rhode Island Ministerial Association on Thursday morning, January 31. I arrived at 10:15 P.M. and was met at the station by Rabbi Israel M. Goldman who was responsible for my invitation to address that Association. He took me to the Biltmore Hotel near the railroad station and we chatted in the lunch room till after 12:00. Nothing of special interest developed in the course of the conversation. The only thing that stands out in my mind is his comment on Dr. Ephros' address on Bialik, which he said was the finest thing he had ever heard. "Only a poet, such as Ephros is, could do justice to Bialik," he said. "He actually lifted us out of ourselves."

This Dr. Ephros who is both a scholar and a poet was rabbi of the Conservative congregation in Buffalo. That congregation is a typical illustration of the absolute lack of any norm or standard even in the institutionalized aspect of Jewish life. I need only mention the four rabbis who have served it within the last twenty-five years. First there was Drob, narrowly orthodox devoid of modern culture and unconscious of any fundamental clash between tradition and modernism. Then came Eichler, an opportunist with a nack for glib generalities and making friends. (Perhaps he might be considered the congregation's norm, since his ministry lasted to the day of his death and he probably would have died as its rabbi, even if he had lived much longer.) He was succeeded by Ephros. And now that Ephros has resigned (by mutual consent, I believe) Magil is its rabbi. He is intellectually a light weight, but he has some of the qualities of a go-getter and, if I am not mistaken, he is quite successful.

The meeting I was to address was one of the quarterly meetings held by the Ministerial Association which is said to include 400 clergymen of various Protestant denominations. If I am not mistaken Israel Goldman is the only Jewish member they have and he is a member of the Executive Committee.

The meeting took place in the vestry room of his synagogue (known as Temple Emanuel). There were about seventy present. Goldman led in a brief and well arranged devotional program which included the singing of two melodies from the Yom Kippur liturgy. The remarks which he made apropos of the Association meeting in the synagogue were witty and well spoken. The chairman, Rev. Claxton, read two letters; one from Dr. Olinchy and the other from Dr. S. S. Wise. In both of them there was mention of me. In Wise's, of course, there was high laudation.

I read the paper on "A New Approach to the Problem of Tolerance" from 11:20 to 12:30. This was followed by discussion to 1:20. Some of the questions were quite searching. I believe that my answers were adequate.

After that I had lunch with Rabbis Goldman and Schussheim of Providence and Rabbi Morton Goldberg of Fall River at the Biltmore Hotel. The conversation finally drifted to the competition in Providence between the synagogue and the community center. I told Goldman and Schussheim that by merely opposing the community center they will not be making their own position stronger. The only reasonable solution lay, in my opinion, in the organization of a Jewish community in Providence and in having the rabbis become functionaries of the community, instead of serving merely their respective congregations.

Today we of the SAJ celebrated the 13th anniversary of the first service held under our auspices. In the morning I delivered a talk in which I addressed myself particularly to the eight of the twenty-one founders of the society, whom I had called out by name, and who after they had marched around the synagogue led by the cantor (Beimel substituted for Nathanson) carrying the Torah, seated themselves immediately in front of the pulpit.

In my remarks I stated that the purpose of the anniversary was to keep alive the enthusiasm and sense of purpose which animated the group when it organized the SAJ. Like all creative movements it had its origin in revolt and faith, revolt against a condition that had become unsatisfactory

and faith in the possibilities that had been dormant. I then went on to describe the break with the Jewish Center and the physical and moral difficulties against which we had to contend during the first years of our existence. I gave them credit not only for dropping their investments in the Jewish Center but also for following one, who at that time, stood practically alone in my ideas about Judaism. I spoke of the SAJ as the second attempt in American Jewish life to reckon with the requirements of the present-day environment. The first was the Reformist movement inaugurated by Isaac M. Wise.

During all these years that I have been advocating the conception of Judaism as a civilization I have sought to find a method of implementing that conception. At first I thought that if the synagogue were transformed into a center that would house the leisure activities of our people the problem of Jewish life in this country would be solved. Before long I realized that that was far from enough. Without an ideology reconstructed on lines of what is best in modern thought and social endeavor I realized the mere physical transformation of the synagogue would not get us very far. It was this in particular that brought the SAJ into being. But now I am convinced that even the best of ideologies is not enough. The next step must be the reconstruction of the communal life of our people. Without a social environment to fortify Jewish thinking and Jewish living, all our endeavors were merely like trying to heat the street.

I closed with an appeal to the members that they rededicate themselves to the covenant by which we had bound ourselves in establishing the SAJ, a covenant that bore resemblance to the one our ancestors entered into at Sinai under the leadership of Moses. (This was said in allusion to today's Torah reading which was "Mishpatim.")

I received a letter from Julius H. Greenstone, who is chairman of the Committee on Jewish Law of the Rabbinical Assembly, informing me of the meeting scheduled for Monday, Feb. 11. "The purpose of this meeting," the letter reads, "is to discuss ways and means of making the work of the Committee more effective, which may involve the reorganization of the Committee on a somewhat different basis." I was going to reply that I was prevented from attending, but that in response to his invitation to add any thoughts on the subject that might be of service to the meeting I was going to make a very bold suggestion, which I was sure would be pooh-poohed by some members of the Committee. (I can imagine Morris Levine making a wry face as the letter would be read.) The suggestion was that the Committee, instead of limiting itself to answering questions of law, undertake to formulate a code, a new Shulkan Aruk, the basis of -- of what! I wouldn't dare mention Judaism as a Civilization. I therefore changed my mind about making that suggestion to him.

But it occurred to me why could I not have the few men who are in sympathy with my approach collaborate with me, say next summer, on a code of that kind?

This is scheme number what?

* * *

Monday, February 4, 1935

This evening I had a number of SAJ people at the house whom I had invited to meet Morris Rothenberg, the president of the ZOA for the purpose of starting the drive for the Palestine Fund. The following were present: A. Liebovitz, Osserman, Hillson, Wachman, Ira Kaplan, Jacob Klein, Mrs. Gelb, J.H. Rubin, Bromberg, Posis, Ira and I. After Rothenberg got through speaking I realized that he had come to appeal only for the National Fund and Extension Fund (toward which the organization wants to raise $350,000 throughout the

country) and not toward the United Appeal (which is to be for the JDC and Palestine and which will aim to raise about $3,200,000). This necessitated our arriving at a plan similar to that of the Chest. We assumed a quota of $10,000 as a kind of Chest for Palestine, 1/3 of that amount to go toward National Fund and Extension Fund and the rest to go toward the genral fund. $1900 was pledged among those present including 250 which Abraham Siegel who is at present in Florida contributed by message through his son.

* * *

Tuesday, February 5, 1935

This afternoon at 4:30 I went to see Dr. Cyrus Adler in reference to the budget of the Teachers Institute and Seminary College for next year. The teaching load (to use the slang of the social workers) before 1931 was 148 hours. Now it amounts to 103 hours. The retirement was made possible by cutting out all post-graduate courses, arts and crafts, and doing away with the Freshman class in the Teachers Institute. Most of these courses have to be reinstated if those who are to be graduated are to fulfil the usual requirements. Moreover, many of the graduates are asking for courses in advanced Hebrew and some want to proceed with graduate work. All this calls for a larger budget than the one we have been living on these last few years.

When I stated these facts to Adler he gave the same reply that he had given me at least twice before in answer to similar demands on my part. 1) The income from the endowment has shrunk. Government bonds will not yield more than 2%, mortgages no more than 3½ to 4% etc. Dropsie College is even worse off, because it has no popular support to draw from. The 19,000 interest the college was to have received this month has not been forthcoming due to litigation. All the universities except Columbia are in difficulties. Penn. U.

has lost one million of its annual income. 2) The income from membership since July (for seven months) is over $3000 more than last year (12,000 in all). 3) Block (the accountant who has been the bane of my life the last eight or ten years) says the seminary will have a deficit of $20,000 this year. 4) I shouldn't complain. The Library that used to spend $10,000 a year spends about $250. 5) Three of the Seminary Faculty should by right be retired but the Seminary hasn't the means.

I also mentioned to him the possibility of my asking for a sabbatical leave for a year. He said that I should put the request in writing, because he didn't want to grant the leave without the consent of the Board of Trustees. In fact he was taken to task by the Board for having permitted Prof. Ginzberg to go to Palestine a year ago for the purpose of acting on the Committee to reorganize the Hebrew University. The Board felt that Ginzberg had been away a year and had been sick another half a year and it was not right to allow him to miss more of his work.

Not that the committee did any good, Adler went on to say. Although their report did not appear in the press, it is circulating by word of mouth, especially in Palestine where the least rumor is exaggerated. They found fault with Kligler and Magnes as not being up to the academic standard of the European universities. It seems that they did not think very much of American academic training. At one of the meetings he pointed out to the members of the committee that the American Universities had the advantage over the European for not only did they take over the best traditions of the European universities whence their first teachers came, but were less provincial than the European universities because they drew on more than one tradition. It is just this kind of garrulity that has made him the "great man" he is.

* * *

Friday, February 8, 1935

Last Wednesday I spoke at the Stamford Community Center. The lecture had been arranged through the Jewish Welfare Board, as had been the case with the Institute at Pittsburgh. The attendance was about 175. Originally they were seated in the large auditorium but when I realized that the number was too small for the auditorium I asked that the audience go over to the smaller auditorium nearby.

The majority of the people seemed to be of the more conservative type and on the whole did not reveal too much intelligence. I was introduced by Rabbi Louis Haas who made a few wooden remarks and then tried to give a summary of the book, which was all wrong and entirely uncalled for. He is one of the Seminary graduates of 1912, who though he was in my class 2½ years, thought he was there only one year.

Haas happened to meet me at the Seminary lunch room about eight days before I came to Stamford. Knowing that I had been scheduled to speak there, he informed me that the Center was competing successfully with his synagogue and he intimated that I should in the address

Saturday night, February 9, 1935

I was scheduled to give emphasize the primacy of the synagogue. I told him, of course, that I couldn't do any such thing, because, in my opinion, the community center was meeting a need and the synagogue will survive only by becoming a community center.

This is not the first time I have come across evidences of a serious conflict between the center and the synagogue. I believe it is a good thing for this conflict to come to a head, because it might hasten the process of communal organization. I have been urging Rabbi Samuel M. Cohen to make this conflict the main topic of discussion at the next convention of the United Synagogue.

Much to my surprise the first printing of my book was exhausted about a month ago. I understand that Macmillan had printed 1500 copies, of which I received 650. The publication of the book cost me about $3800 of which I have received back a little over $2000. I ordered a second printing of the book yesterday. The understanding is that I am to buy 500 copies at $1.65. Macmillans will sell the other 500 at the regular price and I expect to sell my copies at a reduced rate to those who will buy in quantities five or more.

During the summer I gave Dinin a number of Communist pamphlets in Yiddish and English (which had been sent to me by Rabbi Halper) for the purpose of formulating the communist indictment against Jewish religion and Zionism. I wanted to reply to that indictment, because I felt that it was based as far as the Jewish religion is concerned-on the static and traditional view of Judaism. An evolutionary conception of the Jewish religion could be made compatible with the ethical principles implied in and denied by Communism.

In view of the fact that the Seminar this year did not seem to have elicited much work from the men I thought I would turn these pamphlets over to them and have them refute the indictment against the Jewish religion. Sooner or later they will beconfronted with the arguments advanced by communists. To be sure of themselves rabbis should know how to meet those arguments. Tonight I worked out a plan whereby they would make themselves responsible for a statement that would refute the indictment point by point.

After they left I proceeded to read Dinin's summary to the end. When I came to the charge against Zionism I could not but see the justice of most of the contentions against the entire movement. I dread to think that I have deluded myself and others all these years, yet I shall not wince from drawing that conclusion if I

shall find after further thought that I have been on the wrong track. I swear by everything that is sacred that I want to do what is right and to teach nothing but what I believe in with every fibre in my being. These are times when it seems impossible to commit oneself to any cause wholeheartedly without sinning against one's better nature that refuses to be narrow and dogmatic and that cannot accept the cruel judgment which communism passes upon the idealism (even if mistaken) of thousands of mankind's leaders.

Here I am the victim of conflict that is raging in my soul. If I could only find some way of engaging in work that would not require my committing myself to either horn of the dilemma. Only this afternoon I was making plans to go to Palestine. After the summary I have read tonight I feel that I would only be aggravating the inner conflict if I were to implicate myself more deeply in the Palestine project.

This business of leading a dual life is getting to be unbearable.

* * *

Sunday, February 10, 1935

Viewing my situation realistically, there is no possibility of my identifying myself with the communist movement. It would involve too much of a physical wrench and even psychologically there are many things in communism which repel me, e.g. its materialistic dogmation, its ruthlessness toward the middle class and white collar slaves, etc. But there is much in communism which I regard as indispensable to the welfare of society. Some of it I openly avow and preach. The doctrines of classless society, of the abolition of profit and the principle from each according to his abilities and to each according to his needs, I have preached from the pulpit and am embodying in my "The World as it Ought to Be."

My greatest difficulty is in squaring the communist analyses of anti-Semitism and Zionism with my pleas for communal organization and the upbuilding of Palestine, or to put it more correctly, between the communist approach to the Jewish problem and mine. What I have been attempting all along has been to effect a synthesis between the two. That has required my sublimating some of my communist beliefs. But that is something I cannot get others to do. They prefer to take communism whole and unmodified and to forget about Judaism altogether.

If the only way out of this impasse is just to live empiricall and not worry about the ultimate outcome then I should try to confine myself to my work at the Seminary and give up the idea of reconstructing Jewish life. But then the problem arises as to what I am to teach if I am to evade the fundamental issues of present day Jewish life and thought. Perhaps I might succeed in effectuating the sublimation of the above mentioned doctrines best by casting them into the form of "The World as it Ought to Be." In any event, just now I am in no mood to make preparations for spending the year of the sabbatical leave in Palestine.

Last Thursday Rubashow and Zuckerman who are touring the country in behalf of Histadrut Ha-Poalim came to see me. I had occasion to express my sympathy with the Histadrut in a telegram I sent not long ago to the conference held in this city. They asked me that I should get the members of the Rabbinical Assembly to issue a statement similar to that recently issued by the 241 rabbis of the Central Conference.

Now one of the accusations against the Histadrut by the communists is the fact that the Histadrut boycotts Arab labor. Here is a clear case where the communists are wrong. Arab labor is employed

by the Jewish capitalists because it is cheaper. But it is also true that the Histadrut is often prepared to undersell Arab labor in order that Jews should have employment and be the ones to upbuild the land. This presents a situation where the abstract ideologies of everybody concerned land one in a blind alley. It is a clear case of conflict between nationalistic and class interests but a very difficult one in which to resolve the conflict because there seems to be equal merit on both sides.

I am quite sure that if the authors of the communist pamphlets were psycho-analyzed it would be found that in their childhood they were victims of repressive authority and harsh realities. This is why they are ?(278) as rebels against the past and materialists in their attitudes to all forms of idealism.

I know quite well that my vacillation, compromises and opportunism do little credit to my ethical reputation, but I prefer to be conscious of these tendencies in myself to being ashamed of them and by repressing them develop all kinds of neuroses. I frankly prefer to be "psychologically associated" [Psychologically-whole] and ethically unadjusted to being half adjusted ethically and "psychologically dissociated." If I were to pursue this subject casuistically I might even prove that it is more ethical to be half-adjusted ethically and psychologically whole than to strain for complete ethical adjustment at the expense of my psychological health. In short, Koheleth was right when he said (p.278) אל תהי צדיק הרבה .

* * *

Monday, February 11, 1935

Rabbi Jacob S. Minkin has written a book called "The Romance of Hasidism." He had shown it to Prof. Ginzberg, who not only contributed some notes to it, but also gave it his hearty endorsement in a letter which Minkin expects to use in publicizing the book. A Jewish journalist, George Sokolsky who has written "We

Tuesday, February 12, 1935

Jews" also wrote to Minkin in approval of his book. Minkin had sent me the manuscript in the hope of getting from me a similar endorsement. But when I began reading it I found the style foreign, bombastic and abounding in mixed metaphors. In the opening paragraph Hasidism is a bird, a tree and a river all in one. The content is worthy of a sophomore, full of misstatements and unwarranted ~~xxxxxxxxxxxx~~ generalizations.

What was I to do? I knew that he has been without a position for a long time and that he must have found tremendous spiritual compensation in working on this book and looking forward to its publication. How could I tell him what I thought of the manuscript? Yet I did not want to lie to him, in fact I couldn't even if I wanted to. I therefore had him come to see me and told him quite plainly how I felt about his effort and indicated to him specifically the faults in his style and the mistakes in statements of fact. Instead of reacting with a sense of resentment or discouragement he seemed to be grateful and said he would go through the entire book as I advised him to make the necessary changes both in style and content.

The New York group of Reform rabbis had invited me to speak to them on my book at a luncheon meeting which they held today, but I had to refuse the invitation because I teach at the Seminary on Tuesdays. They then asked Ira to speak to them on the same subject.

A little while ago Ira reported to me the kind of questions the eight or nine of them who spoke asked. I was accused of being both orthodox and reformist, nazi and communist. etc. Foster of Newark seemed to be the most bitter inhis attack and Lyons of Brooklyn a close second. The attendance was about 25.

* * *

Tuesday, February 19, 1935

The custom of old time Jews, especially Hasidim, to wear earlocks is prohibited by the Sages onthe ground of its being a gentile fashion (p.279)
(Sefra Ahare, Par. 9, Ch. XIII)

The rabbis also conceived of the Shekinah as taking the guise of a dove. (Ex. R.s.40)

* * *

Wednesday, February 20, 1935

I am still continuing the series of lectures both at the Seminary and at the SAJ services (on alternate weeks) on the theme "Human Life as it Ought to Be." I have now reached the point where I have to apply the general principles thus far arrived at to the specific human relationships. The first relationship to be tackled is that of parent and child. For that purpose I read through "The Psycho-Analytic Study of the Family" by J. C. Flugel.

What is it about these books -- even the best of them -- that prevents their information from being integrated with one's own thinking, unless one analyses that information and rearranges it completely. Perhaps this fact supplies the answer to the question: Why do most people who know a good deal hold their knowledge the way a glass holds water and not the way the stomach holds food? It may be because the knowledge which they acquire retains the mind pattern of the one who imparted it to them. Instead of breaking up that knowledge so as

to be assimilable by their own type of thinking, they try to hold it in the form given to it by the mind pattern of the one who transmitted it to them. This is why we are afflicted with the presence in academic circles of so many learned ignoramuses, and why knowledge in general is so little educative.

It was not before I hit upon an integrating idea arising out of the general problem of human conduct I am concerned with that I found myself capable of assimilating the contents of the book by Fluge. That integrating idea was the following: One of the basic causes of maladjustment in human life is the fact that while intellectually most people outgrow entirely their infantile state, emotionally very few do so. Intellectually we may be grown up men and women, but emotionally we are still infants. If we were not deceived by appearances we would would realize that when we see parents bringing up children, we are really witnessing big babies trying to bring up little babies. We shall not get very far with the best laid schemes of social and economic reform unless we at the same time reckon fully with the prevailing infantilism of human nature. Beneath the austere presence of statesmen, bishops, financiers and dictators rage infantile emotions made dangerous by the power and knowledge they possess. The problem of human life will remain insoluble so long as we remain ignorant of the conditions necessary to emotional maturation. This is where the Freudian approach to the subconscious can help us. Freud's discovery of the presence of unconscious motives and unresolved conflicts deals with the conditions reponsible for the arrested development emotionally of most human beings. However much Freud, Jung and Adler differ among themselves as to the nature of the unconscious motives they are agreed that it is in the parent-child relationship where the problem of directing their development begins. From this point on one can see the connection between the ideas thus far worked out in the series and the main principles of psycho-analysis.

Possibly I am as much in need of being stimulated to outgrow infantilism as the people in my audience. It may therefore be that this course of lectures will have a good effect on me.

Sunday (Feb. 17) night the Alumni of the Teachers Institute celebrated the twenty-fifth anniversary of the founding of the Teachers Institute (I couldn't get myself to say "of the founding of their alma mater, because that would be a mixed metaphor of which I have a veritable dread). The Alumni had originally hoped that the Seminary would hold a convocation in honor of the event some time at the beginning of this year, but Finkelstein and Adler managed to kill that hope. At first they postponed the convocation to some time in January and later came to the conclusion that it doesn't pay to make any fuss about it, and so the idea was about to die a natural death. But the Alumni at the instigation of Mrs. Hajnalka Winer wouldn't let it die altogether. At the meeting held in her home on Sunday, Nov. 18, at which I was present, they decided to have a dinner. A. Schoolman was chairman of the arrangements committee. He seems to have managed everything well except in the matter of inviting the members of the Seminary Faculty to the banquet and Morris Levine to be one of the speakers. Knowing that the alumni would not respond unless the cost per head was reasonable, he had to keep the expense down as much as possible and he therefore did not feel like inviting the members of the Faculty gratis. He therefore sent them the ordinary circular which stated the cost per person. When. Prof. Ginzberg got it he indignantly threw it into the wastebasket. The others probably did the same. Someone must have told Schoolman about the effect of his circular, because he then sent letters of invitation to the dinner and apologized for the circulars. But no one of the Faculty showed up. Finkelstein and Davidson, however, sent telegrams of congratulation.

The case with Levine was this. He was offended at the contents of the letter inviting him to represent the TI Faculty. In the afternoon as he met me in the hallway he showed me that letter. While I admitted it wasn't couched in the highest diplomatic style, I wouldn't have made any fuss about it. But Schoolman committed another unforgivable sin. He called Levine Rabbi instead of Professor. Levine once laced it into Chipkin for daring to call him Rabbi and I understand he did the same to Schoolman. The upshot was that he did not come to the dinner.

The dinner was attended by about 240 people of whom I should judge about 125 were alumni. The speeches began about 9:35 and lasted to about 12:30. The toast-master, E. Halpern was awful. Cyrus Adler who had come with his wife was the first one to speak. As is usual with him he gave the arachaeological background of the TI. Although I had been announced in the invitations as the guest of honor, he had nothing to say about me or my services to the institution. Fortunately I somehow did not note that fact at the time and realized it only later when Lena called my attention to it. I suppose if I had noticed his failure to say anything about me, I might have said something indiscreet when my turn to speak came.

While the dinner was being served he and I conversed. Just before the speeches began he came to the subject of the crowding of Jews into law and medicine. He simply couldn't understand why they didn't go into engineering and mining. When I pointed out to him that Jews hadn't the slightest chance of getting employment with the big corporations, he replied that they ought to take up bookbinding. His wife had to have a book bound and she could find only one bookbinder who could do the fancy kind of binding for her and he had so much work that he couldn't promise to have the work done for her before three or four months. Or why shouldn't they take up wrought

iron work like that of the Seminary gate made by a Mr. Yellin? When I suggested that it required artistic ability to take up that kind of a calling and that the problem of unemployment was one in which the masses who had no special ability were concerned, he simply couldn't understand. And that's a leader in Israel!

The other speakers were Sol. M. Stroock, Mrs. Ed. Epstein, Mrs. H. Winer, Scharfstein (who took Levine's place) Hyman on behalf of the Seminary students and three students representing the TI., the Seminary College and the Friedlaender Classes respectively, Dr. Benderly and myself. They all spoke in the highest terms of my work and influence. Once we make a speech about somebody the very need of being eloquent compels us to exaggerate his virtue and achievements, otherwise our remarks are bound to fall flat.

My own speech coming at the end of a three hour talk-fest might have been worse than what it was - although it wasn't so bad - had I not worked on it the night before.

On Monday I took the 12:55 to Boston and was met at the stati by George Cohen the president, and Sidd (originally Sidorofsky) the vice president of the Temple Israel Men's Club under whose auspices I was to give the lecture at the Temple Israel Lyceum that night.

When I received the circular of the lecture series in which mine was included I learned that I was scheduled to speak on "Socialism, Marxism and Judaism," the same lecture as I had given a year ago at Ford Hall. I immediately wrote to Cohen telling that I was not a professional lecturer and that I preferred to speak on a subject in which I happened to be interested at the time. I suggested two topics and he chose the one entitled "The Evolution of the Jewish Religion." In answer to his invitation that I have dinner with him I replied that I did not like to each much before I lectured and woul only take a piece of fish and a cup of coffee.